DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 339 24 EF 001 786

By-Cole, Stanley Mason

A STUDY OF LEASING PRACTICES OF PUBLIC SCHOOL LANDS IN COLORADO. FINAL REPORT.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No-BR-7-8167

Pub Date 15 Apr 68

Grant-OEG-1-7-078167-3728

Note-129p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$5.24

Descriptors-*BIBLIOGRAPHIES, COST EFFECTIVENESS, *INCOME, *LANDLORDS, *LAND USE, *LEGAL PROBLEMS

Policies pertaining to three basic problems in land leasing practices are examined--(1) to compare income from leases on state school lands with income from leases of similar privately owned land, (2) to identify policies regarding the disposition of conflicting bids on state school land, and (3) to identify policies regarding subleasing school lands and its impact on school funds. It was found that on dry and grazing land, cash rentals on school lands compare favorably with the rentals on private land. The greatest differences in rental rates appear in the area of irrigated farming, where the private land rental rate was considerably higher than the public school land rate. On the basis of information obtained in this study, the State Board of Land Commissioners has been exercising prudent judgement when resolving the conflict bid. The policies concerning subleasing practices have been defined and delineated much more clearly since 1965, although the current subleasing is difficult to control. (NI)

BR-7-8167
PA-24

Final Report
Project No. 7-8167 PA-24
Grant No. OEG-1-7-078167-3728

A STUDY OF LEASING PRACTICES OF PUBLIC SCHOOL LANDS IN COLORADO

April 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

EF 001786
ED022339

Final Report

Project No. 7-8167
Grant No. OEG-1-7-078167-3728

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF LEASING PRACTICES OF PUBLIC SCHOOL LANDS IN COLORADO

Stanley Mason Cole

Colorado State University

Ft. Collins, Colorado

April 15, 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position of policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The project director is grateful to Colorado State University for the opportunity to conduct this research; to the many people in the Research Foundation and the Department of Education for their support and encouragement; to Dr. Herbert A. Smith, Director of Teacher Education at Colorado State University; to the Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners; President Raymond H. Simpson, Register Howard M. Shults, Engineer Wesley E. Woodward, Mineral Director W. H. Pattison, Administrative Officer Anthony Sabatini, and their secretaries for the timely counsel and cooperation that helped immeasurably to bring this study to its conclusion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables iv

Chapters

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. RESEARCH PROBLEM 7

III. OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURE 10

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND FINDINGS 13

V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS 49

Bibliography 53

APPENDIX A: Letter of Transmittal
Vita of Valuation Consultant 54

APPENDIX B: Form for Lease of State Lands 58

APPENDIX C: Tabulation of Conflicting Bids 63

TABLES

Tables		Page
TABLE 1	Conflicting Applications	3

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The first comprehensive study of the school land leasing problem was made in 1960 by the Legislative Council of the Colorado General Assembly. At that time an alleged conflict of interest in the administration of public school land brought an investigation of the administration of public school lands in Colorado.

The purpose of this study was stated to be: "to study the procedures and policies of the State Board of Land Commissioners with a view toward securing a maximum revenue yield to the public school fund."[1]

A number of specific problems were examined concerning the leasing practices followed by the State Board of Land Commissioners. One of the major considerations was a comparison of rental income per acre from surface leases of land in Colorado with income from surface leases in eight other states.

Further, it was found in 1960 by the Legislative Council that, "The situation with regard to lease rate policies of the land board is not clear. For example, at the Denver meeting, Mr. Willburn, board commissioner engineer, said that the rental fee is arrived at by the productivity of what the land is being leased for. On the other hand, at the Colorado Springs meeting, Mr. Ramsey, board president, reported that "when a man comes in there, and renewed (sic) a lease for six years, and went out there the next day and put it in a five-year soil bank contract, we knew nothing about that, and cared less, as a matter of fact."[2]

This raises the question as to how the matter of productivity is evaluated if the board does not care to know the purpose for which the land will be used, especially in view of the fact that the board knowingly would issue a lease at 37¢ per acre, part of which, at least, was placed in the federal soil bank program.

The council further questioned leasing criteria and practices when lease rates were lowered:

---

[1] Public School Lands in Colorado. Colorado Legislative Council. Denver, Colorado. Research Publication No. 47. December 1960. p. i.

[2] Ibid., p. xxi.

Lease Rate Reductions. In reviewing the board's proceedings, a few instances were noted where lease rates were reduced. One instance, reported in the proceedings of February 28, 1955, was to the effect that the board felt the lease to Mr. Carl Hussey was too high whereupon it ordered the old lease cancelled and a new five-year lease issued. The original lease, S-28241, was issued for the period March 6, 1954, to March 6, 1959, at the annual rates of $5.00 per acre on 140 acres of agricultural land and 34¢ per acre on the 500 acres of grazing land.

A similar report to the Hussey lease is noted in the proceedings for June 29, 1956, as follows:

> "Because of the rental rate being excessive, the Board ordered the cancellation of Lease No. S-27709, effective March 25, 1956, and under Application 56/373 a new five-year lease is granted the lessee at a rental rate of $0.40 per acre per annum, the lease to date from March 25, 1956. Lessee, Eva Adcock."

S-27709, which was a five-year grazing lease beginning on March 25, 1953, carried a yearly rate of $1.25 per acre on 59.75 acres of grazing land. It is noted that these actions were taken under the provisions of the Colorado statutes, being sections 112-3-9 and 112-3-14.

The pertinent literature revealed that much confusion exists relative to lease rates and practices.

In 1963, a two-part work by N. K. Roberts and E. B. Wennergner at Utah State University discussed rental practices in Utah and has relevance to the situation in Colorado. In the bulletin entitled, The Economics of Selecting and Administering State Lands for Grazing Use, a discussion of the economic impact on ranches if grazing fees are raised is presented.

Raising grazing fees on public lands will increase the costs of operation for ranchers. The immediate effect will be a decrease in net ranch returns. For ranchers with cost-return structures that cannot withstand increased costs over the long-run, operational adjustments must be made to stay in business. Adjustments may take the form of changing size..... in ranching, or adjustments can take the form of reorganizing resources for more intensive and productive uses.

"In addition to the immediate decrease in income, a drop in value of ranch capital would be realized at the time of sale. This may well be the most significant impact of fee increases..."[3]

---

[3] N. K. Roberts and E. B. Wennergner, The Economics of Selecting and Administering State Lands for Grazing Use, Bulletin 443, Agriculture Experiment Station, Utah State University Logan, 1963, p. 10.

It certainly would not be wise to impose a rental rate fee on school land in Colorado so high that a rancher or farmer could not afford to pay. It is not a matter of supporting the stock raising or farming interest in the state, but rather setting the rates at a realistic figure to bring maximum revenue to the school fund and the farmer or rancher still have an economically efficient unit.

But what are realistic rates for rental purposes? There were no studies that indicate fair rates of rental for both the farmer or rancher and the School Income Fund in the State of Colorado. There are available statistics on a state to state basis but the nature of the topography is so diverse and the economics of the states differ to a degree that these statistics tell little.

The problem of conflicting bids also needed review.

In the last six years, 1960 through 1965, a total of 156 persons submitted conflicting applications for grazing leases on state school land. These applications may be submitted by anyone desiring to lease school lands at the time any of the present leases expire. The conflicting applications were for a total of 122,664.16 acres of land.

Table 1 shows the increasing number of conflicting bids and the increasing number of acres involved each year. How these conflicting bids are acted upon will have considerable influence on the School Income Fund in Colorado. It seems necessary to suggest a penetrating look into the administration practices followed by the State Board of Land Commissioners.

TABLE I

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

Year	Number of Applications	Acres Involved	Average Offer Per Acre
1960	30	36,971	$0.84
1961	11	6,200	0.91
1962	18	12,751	1.06
1963	30	21,048	0.95
1964	32	20,363.39	NA
1965	35	25,310.77	NA

Little was available in the literature concerning the practice of "subleasing." The writer references were made to find any studies or writings in this area. Two specific references were made to the practice however, one in the Denver Post in 1960 and the second in the Legislative Council Minority Report of 1960.

Below is quoted a portion of the Denver Post editorial concerning subleasing (trafficking) practices:

> The Legislature now needs to look at the problem in its proper perspective. Are the lands bringing in a reasonable amount of money for the school fund? Should the lands be sold? Is there trafficking in leases without board approval? How can competitive bidding be made more effective?[4]

The Legislative Council findings were as follows:

Subleasing Policies. Subleasing policies followed by the land board vary. In the lease contract, item number four provides:

> "Subleasing during any part of lease period will automatically cause loss of priority or preference right to renewal."*

However, exactly what constitutes subleasing is another subject for board determination. In this respect, for example, in its bulletin of May 27, 1955, the board stated that "Pasturing of cattle belonging to other than the lessee will not necessarily be considered subleasing." This position was further confused in the board's bulletin of September 23, 1957, when it said:

> "In view of the present grazing law under which we are operating, we do not consider taking in cattle to pasture a violation of the lease contract..."

IN JANUARY OF 1955, EXAMPLES WERE NOTED IN THE BOARD'S PROCEEDINGS OF THREE DIFFERENT APPROACHES ON THE PART OF THE BOARD TO SUBLEASING PRACTICES, AND WHILE OTHER LIKE EXAMPLES WERE NOTED SUBSEQUENTLY IN LATER BOARD PROCEEDINGS, THESE THREE CASES PERHAPS WILL ILLUSTRATE THE SITUATION.

IN THE FIRST EXAMPLE, ON JANUARY 14, 1955, THE BOARD ORDERED THAT LEASE NUMBER S-25867 NOT BE RENEWED TO MR. L. D. BANTA BECAUSE OF HIS CONTINUOUS SUBLEASING. ON THE OTHER HAND, ON JANUARY 31, 1955, THE BOARD ORDERED A NEW FIVE-YEAR GRAZING LEASE BE ISSUED TO MR. W. C. WHEELER AT A RENTAL RATE OF 34¢

---

[4] Denver Post, 1960.
*See Appendix B for a copy of the Lease Contract.

PER ACRE. THE BOARD ALSO ORDERED THAT ACCEPTANCE BE MADE OF $57 IN FULL SETTLEMENT OF SUBLEASING BY MR. WHEELER DURING THE 1954 SEASON. At that same meeting, the board issued a lease to Mr. John C. Vroman, Jr., with the following comment:

> "This is to be an immunity lease and rental rates are to apply for the full five year term of the lease. Lessee is granted the privilege of subleasing for the term of the lease."[5] (Emphasis added)

The state land board reports that immunity leases are no longer issued as a result of a change in policy in 1956.

A study of the available literature reveals the need for additional evidence to establish clear policies regarding (1) the setting of reasonable lease rent rates on school lands in Colorado, (2) the determination of existing rules, procedures and administrative practices concerning the disposition of conflicting bids on school lands and (3) the determination of existing rules, procedures and administrative practice concerning the practice of subleasing school land in Colorado.

The educational leaders in the state also need a basis to make judgments concerning leasing practices. Just recently (September, 1966) the following resolution was referred to the Legislative Commission of the Colorado Education Association.

> REFERRED
> 1. School Lands
>
> Resolved that the CEA support legislation leading to the sale of school lands when it is economically feasible. Economic feasibility should be based on net income to schools after considering income from investment of sale price plus income from property tax not previously collected on such lands in relation to present rental fees and projected increases invalue of said lands.
>
> Submitted by Kiowa County Re-1 Education Association.
>
> Reason: School land, in many areas, is not being rented at rates high enough to realize maximum income to the state. For example, land selling for $30 per acre is renting for $.42 per acre. This is an investment rate of 1.4 percent. Why not sell the land and invest the money at 4 or 5 percent; also if

---

[5] Colorado Legislative Council. op. cit., p. xxi.

> sold, the land would then be placed on the tax roll and bring in $.15 per acre taxes every year.

TO LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION.

Many in the state believe that there is a need to raise the rental rates and retain the land. However, it is necessary to first establish what rental rates may be fair for the rancher/farmer and to the School Income Fund. It was these leasing problems that this research project was designed to investigate in depth.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following terms in this research are of such a nature as to require definition:

Subleasing: The practice of acquiring a lease on state public school land and then permitting another tenant to use the land either free or for compensation.

Conflict Bid: When two or more parties wish to acquire state public school land leases at the experation of the prescribed lease period. Competitive offers are then made by the interested parties.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH PROBLEM

The problem on which this research was focused concerned a thorough examination of policies pertaining to three basic problems in leasing practices. More specifically the problem centers around these questions:

(1) How does the revenue produced from state school land leases compare with revenue produced from comparable privately owned lands that are being leased?

(2) What policies and administrative policies are now being followed by the State Board Land Commissioners regarding the disposition of conflicting bids on state school lands?

(3) What policies and administrative practices are now being followed by the State Board of Land Commissioners regarding the practice of subleasing of school land?

The State Board of Land Commissioners have been granted very general and broad power in regard to leasing state public school land. Leasing of surface rights are governed by Colorado Law Article 3, Chapter 112, Public Lands and Rivers.

Section 112-3-18, 1966 Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.) Supplement, provides that public lands will be leased by the board so as to produce an "optimum long-term revenue," with no lease for grazing or agricultural purposes to be issued for a period longer than ten years.[1] In determining maximum benefit to the state in the renewal of any expiring lease, the board is directed to consider the care and use given the land and the development work done by the lessee in conserving and promoting the productivity of the land and the classification, location and contribution to the unit controlled by the lessee. Preference is provided present lessees in that, before the land "shall be leased to anyone other than the present lessee, the present lessee shall be given ten days notice and an opportunity during said ten days to negotiate with the state board of land commissioners concerning a new lease."

---

[1] Lands within city boundaries may be leased for a term not exceeding 50 years. All such lands shall be reappraised and classified at least every five years, and lessees thereof must pay any increased rental or forfeit the land under lease (Section 112-3-20, 1966 C.R.S.).

The section further provides that the board make a listing of all leases in advance of their expiration date, on a quarterly basis, and at least five days prior to the beginning of each quarter a copy of this listing is to be transmitted to the county clerk for posting in a conspicuous place in the courthouse and another copy is posted in the office of the land board.

All lease applications are to be in writing, stipulating the rental the applicant is willing to pay and under such other regulations as the board may prescribe. An applicant must also furnish evidence of his responsibility to carry out the terms of the lease and any applicant other than the present lessee must deposit with his application a sum of money equal to the payment of the first year's rental. The board is granted the power "to cancel and terminate any lease at any time if it finds that a lessee has violated any of the provisions of the lease or made any false statement in his application therefor."

Further, the General Assembly in 1937 authorized the land board to adjust rentals when "in its opinions conditions justify" this action.[2] All lease rentals are payable in advance,[3] and lessees must be bonded to secure the state against loss.[4]

Under the provisions of Section 112-3-6, 1966 C.R.S., the land board may require written reports from its appraisers on such items as the general character, adaptability, and estimated value of land parcels. In this connection, the law also authorizes the state land board to reclassify and reappraise any lands owned by the state at its discretion.[5]

In the event a person applies to lease state land upon which there are improvements belonging to another party, before a lease is issued he must first pay to the owner the price of the improvements as agreed upon by the two parties or as fixed by the land board.[6] Otherwise he cannot be issued a lease.

In amplifying these statutory provisions, the State Board of Land Commissioners has adopted various rules and regulations. At times, however, the board has changed or suspended its own rules as it deemed necessary. (Emphasis added)

---

[2] Section 112-3-14, 1966 C.R.S.
[3] Section 112-3-17, 1966 C.R.S.
[4] Section 112-3-30, 1966 C.R.S.
[5] Section 112-3-9, 1966 C.R.S.
[6] Section 112-3-19, 1966 C.R.S.

By board regulation, lease applications must be filed at least 60 days prior to the expiration of the existing lease. "However," the board points out, "the Board is not obligated to accept the high bid, but can still make the deal which we think will be the best for the State and schools in the long run. In other words, the present lessee will have to meet any other bid which the Board feels is made in good faith and within reason."[7] (See chapter on Conflicting Bids.)

Lessees are permitted to assign their state land leases subject to board approval. Following the adoption of the 1955 amendment to Section 112-3-18, the board reduced the assignment fee levied in such cases to an amount equal to one year's rental. Previously, the board collected a consideration for approving a lease assignment of two and one-half times one year's rent. The board reported its reason for the fee reduction in its bulletin issued on May 27, 1955:

"Under the new law, the holder of a lease has the preference right of being able to meet the high bid, but we do not feel he receives quite so much when he takes over a lease on an assignment, so we are reducing that consideration to one year's rental. When we were collecting two and one-half times an annual rental we took up the old lease and issued a new one so that the assignee had protection for five years; but under the present law that would not work as we are required to post expiration dates in the court houses, and if we arbitrarily issue a new lease for five years, where the old one only had a year or two to run, it would be contrary to law as it would deprive any prospective applicant for land he desires to lease."

In regard to the federal soil banking program, some lessees placed their leased state land in this program, thereby receiving a set income of a given amount per acre for the life of the contract. Some controversy developed over this practice, however, particularly where the land concerned was classified by the state land board as grazing land and not agricultural land, since the federal program had been established to reduce cultivation of crop land. The state land board treated this issue as one not requiring any procedural or policy changes. In essence, the board adopted the position that placing state land in the soil bank was the sole business of the lessee so long as he continued to pay the rental rate which had been set by the board. In 1959, Congress enacted a law prohibiting the placing of any more state-owned land in the soil bank program so that this is no longer a current problem.

---

[7] General Bulletin No. 2, October 14, 1955.

CHAPTER III

OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURE

Project 7-8167 was undertaken to provide information concerning leasing practices on public school land followed by the State Board of Land Commissioners in Colorado. Specifically the objectives of the research are as follows:

(1) To compare income from leases on state school lands with income from leases of similar privately administered lands,

(2) to identify board policies and administrative practices being followed by the State Board of Land Commissioners regarding the disposition of conflicting bids on state school land and

(3) to identify policies and administrative practices being followed by the State Board of Land Commissioners regarding the practices of subleasing school lands and its impact on the school funds in Colorado.

These objectives were formulated in the proposal stage of this research because of the apparent lack of information concerning leasing practices in Colorado.

PROCEDURE

The following procedure was the original outline of Project 7-8167:

The procedure will involve four major steps. Twenty-five leases representing twenty-five sections (640 acres each or 16,000 acres) of state school land will be selected for the purpose of comparing income with twenty-five sections (640 acres each or 16,000 acres) of privately administered land. The twenty-five sections will be selected in such a way as to represent all types of land now being held by the State of Colorado. This land will be selected in consultation with one or more land board members. In addition the recommendations of a valuation consultant will be obtained. The twenty-five sections of privately held land and the twenty-five sections of school lands will be selected from an area east of the Continental Divide since this is the location of most school lands remaining in Colorado. Also the twenty-five sections will be land similar in use and topography to that of each school section selected. The valuations consultant will also be used in the selection of these parcels. He will abstract out of the private leases all economic contingencies such as improvements, water, access and length of lease for the purpose of making income comparisons on the land only. It will be necessary to travel to each of the leases compared for the purpose of establishing the similarity of the state land and the private land.

Second, records on file at the land board will be investigated for the purpose of determining rules, regulations and policies followed in the disposition of conflicting bids on state school land. Also involved will be the tabulation and investigation of the final disposition of the conflicting bids filed on state held lands since 1960. This will be done in an effort to determine if the highest return to the school funds is currently being realized.

Third, an investigation of all the rules, regulations and policies regarding subleasing practices will be made to determine if the public school fund is best being served by such subleasing practices.

The twenty-five sections of privately administered land were selected between May 10 and July 10 of 1967. It was found during the selection procedure that it was neither practical nor desirable to seek complete 640 acre sections. Many sections were partially leased or other circumstances made it impossible to select complete sections. Further, to select land in such a way as to represent all types of land in Colorado, more than twenty-five private held leases had to be used to establish clear trends in leasing income. Therefore, approximately 24,464 acres or slightly over 38 sections were used to establish income from cash rents on private property.

Further, the procedure was modified to put special attention on the South Platte watershed. There are two reasons why this special accord was granted this area.

1. The South Platte watershed contains an adequate sampling of the more productive land use classifications found throughout the State of Colorado.

2. The South Platte watershed contained the greater number of cash rents available for measurement of the leasing activities conducted between private investors.

Various other counties were sampled throughout the State. The foregoing is not meant to exclude other counties investigated.

During August, September and October of 1967 each of the private leases were visited by the principal investigator, the valuation consultant or both of these parties. Also state land in each of the counties covered in the "Analysis of Data" was visited to ascertain its character and use.

The second and third steps of the procedure were carried out on a full time basis during November and December of 1967. Records on file at the State Land Board in Denver were investigated for the purpose of determining rules, regulations and policies pertaining to conflicting bids and sub-leasing practices. At times this was difficult due to the lack of written policies by the board. Much of the policy was discussed on a person to person basis.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND FINDINGS

Limitations on Analysis of Data

During the course of this study it was extremely difficult to find cash rental of private property. The writer feels that a number of cash rentals are currently in effect but it was difficult to get persons to provide information about them. Further, many of the cash rentals on private property were in large blocks, making direct comparisons nearly impossible. There was however, considerable evidence to establish trends in lease income. These trends were established by reviewing records on file at the State Board of Land Commissioners in Denver, Colorado. The principal investigator reviewed in excess of 700 leases on state administered land involving a total of approximately 600,000 acres of land. The income comparisons that follow are based upon the valuation consultants analysis of nearly 38 sections (or 23,464 acres) in private leased land and the extensive data provided by the leases on record in State Land Board Files.

Part 1.

Report of the Valuation Consultant and comparitive figures on State administered lands.

INTRODUCTION

An article entitled "Land Prices and Farm Earnings" by William Scofield, published October 19, 1964 in Farm Real Estate Market Developments states "rent paid for farm lands provide a close approximation of gross returns. Cash rents provide a more (emphasis added) direct measure of the annual use-value of the land."

Considering the foregoing as a foundation, the writer has reported only cash rents between private investors in the following sections of the report in spite of the fact that rents on a crop share basis were more numerous.

Because the intangible factors accruing to the landlord or tenant on a crop share basis were frequently uncertain or immeasurable, the writer restricted his investigation to data that represented evidence from which reasonable conclusions could be drawn, viz., cash rents.

Virtually all of the persons interviewed requested anonymity and in honoring these requests, the writer has identified the various cash leases alphabetically.

LARIMER COUNTY

Larimer County, located in North Central Colorado with the Medicine Bow range of mountains as its westerly boundary, includes an area of approximately 2,640 square miles. The climate in the north and east is comparitively mild with long warm summers and moderate winters while the weather in the mountainous western part is more severe with very heavy snowfall. Its growing season approximates 139 days. The surface is irrigated valley and level plains in the easterly portion and rugged mountains in the west. Elevations range from 4,800 to 13,562 feet. This county lies in the South Platte watershed except for the north west corner which is drained by the Big Laramie River, tributary of the North Platte River. The principle streams are the Cache La Poudre, Big Thompson and Little Thompson, tributaries of the South Platte River and numerous other smaller tributaries.

Cash leases are as follows:

A. Area - 119 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $4,000.00

Type - Irrigated Cropland

Cash Rent per Acre - $33.61

Comments - Landlord pays taxes and furnishes water.

B. Area - 131 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $4,000.00

Type - Irrigated Cropland

Cash Rent per Acre - $30.53

Comments - Landlord pays taxes and furnishes water.

C. Area - 100 acres
Annual Cash Rent - $3,000.00
Type - Irrigated Cropland
Cash Rent per Acre - $30.00
Comments - Landlord pays taxes and furnishes water.

D. Area - 210 acres
Annual Cash Rent - $2,000.00
Type - Sub-irrigated pasture, alfalfa
Cash Rent per Acre - $9.52
Comments - Landlord pays taxes

E. Area - 100 acres
Annual Cash Rent - $5,000.00
Type - Irrigated Cropland
Cash Rent per Acre - $50.00
Comments - Landlord pays taxes and furnishes water.

F Area - 100 acres
Annual Cash Rent - $3,500.00
Type - Irrigated Cropland
Cash Rent per Acre - $35.00
Comments - Landlord pays taxes, tenant furnishes water.

Summary - Larimer County

A. Irrigated Cropland - 550 acres
Annual Cash Rent - $19,500.00
Average Cash Rent per Acre - $35.45

B. Sub-irrigated Pasture, alfalfa - 210 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $2,000.00

Cash Rent per Acre - $9.52

No records of cash rentals on private property for grazing purposes were found. However, the following comparisons can be made:

	Private Lease	State Lease
Grazing	No Data Available	.338 per acre
Dry Farm	No Data Available	2.95 per acre
Irrigated Farm	35.45 per acre	3.75 per acre

The rather large difference in rental here can be attributed to the fact that the landlord owns and furnishes the water plus paying the taxes.

The following range of income of state land in Larimer County is as follows:

Larimer County

	High	Average Cash Lease	Low
Grazing	.50	.338	.20
Dry Farm	2.00	Only 1 lease	---
Irrigated Farm	3.75	Only 1 lease	---

MORGAN COUNTY

Morgan County, located in the north eastern quarter of the state in the South Platte watershed, has an area of approximately 1,300 square miles, and is virtually 36 miles square. The climate is comparatively mild, with long warm summers and short winters with moderate temperatures. The growing season approximates 146 days. The surface is principally level prairie with elevations ranging from 4,100 to 4,600 feet. The South Platte River and its tributaries, mainly Bijou, Badger, and Beaver Creeks cross this county and irrigate its farm lands.

Cash leases are as follows:

A. Area - 1,360

Annual Cash Rent - $4,750.00

Type - Dry Cropland

Cash Rent per Acre - $3.49

Comments - Landlord pays taxes.

The following comparisons can be made in Morgan County:

	Private Lease	State Lease
Grazing	No Data Available	.479 per acre
Dry Farm	$3.49 per acre	2.31 per acre
Irrigated Farm	No Data Available	3.91 per acre

The following range of income on State Land in Morgan County is as follows:

Morgan County

	High	Average Cash Lease	Low
Grazing	1.00	.479	.20
Dry Farm	3.50	2.31	1.00
Irrigated Farm	5.00	3.91	3.00

The following ranges of income were ascertained by the Valuation Consultant on private land:

	High	Average	Low
Grazing	1.25	.60 to .70	.55
Dry Farm	10.94	3.50 to 3.75	2.50
Irrigated Farm	50.00	30.00 to 35.00	25.00

WELD COUNTY

Weld County, located east of center in the northern tier of Colorado Counties, has an area of approximately 4,033 square miles. The climate is dry and generally mild with long, warm summers, moderate winters and a growing season of approximately 138 days. The surface is level or rolling prairies with low hills near the westerly border and elevations ranging from 4,400 to 5,000 feet. The South Platte River and its tributaries, the Cache La Poudre, Big Thompson, Little Thompson, Boulder, St. Vrain, and other small streams drain the county.

Cash Leases are as follows:

A. Area - 440 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $550.00

Type - Dryland Pasture

Cash Rent per Acre - $1.25

Comments - Landlord pays taxes.

B. Area - 1,400 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $5,250.00

Type - Dry Cropland

Cash Rent per Acre - $3.75

Comments - Landlord pays taxes.

C. Area - 2,000 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $5,000.00

Type - Dry Cropland

Cash Rent per Acre - $2.50

Comments - Landlord pays taxes

D. Area - 7,000 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $3,850.00

Type - Dryland Pasture

Cash Rent per Acre - $.55

Comments - Numerous owners; conditions as to payment of taxes vary.

E. Area - 106 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $3,700.00

Type - Irrigated Cropland

Cash Rent per Acre - $34.90

Comments - Landlord pays taxes and furnishes water

Summary - Weld County

A. Irrigated Cropland - 106 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $3,700.00

Cash Rent per Acre - $34.90

B. Dry Cropland - 3,400 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $10,250.00

Average Cash Rent per Acre - $3.01

C. Dryland Pasture - 7,440 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $4,400.00

Average Cash Rent per Acre - $.59

The following comparisons can be made in Weld County:

	Private Lease	State Lease
Grazing	.59 per acre	.468 per acre
Dry Farm	3.01 per acre	2.446 per acre
Irrigated Farm	34.90 per acre	3.99 per acre

The range of prices on public land are as follows:

Weld County

	High	Average Cash Lease	Low
Grazing	1.25	.468	.25
Dry Farm	4.00	2.446	1.00
Irrigated Farm	6.00	3.99	2.75

The range of prices on private land as ascertained by the Valuation Consultant are as follows:

	High	Average	Low
Grazing	$ 1.25	$ .60- .70	$ .55
Dry Farm	10.94	3.50- 3.75	2.50
Irrigated Farm	50.00	30.00-35.00	25.00

LOGAN COUNTY

Logan County, in northeastern Colorado, is rectangular in outline with an area of approximately 1,849 square miles. The average growing season is 139 days. The surface is generally level or rolling except for a few hilly areas in the north.

Elevation ranges from 3,600 feet to approximately 4,100 feet. The South Platte River crosses the county and contains most of the fertile irrigated land. The climate is comparatively mild with short moderate winters and long warm summers.

Cash leases are as follows:

A. Area - 1,200 acres
Annual Cash Rent - $11,000.00
Type - Sub-irrigated pasture, alfalfa
Cash Rent per Acre - $9.16
Comments - Landlord pays taxes

B. Area - 1,100 acres
Annual Cash Rent - $5,500.00
Type - 900 acres short pasture, 200 acres sub-irrigated, alfalfa
Cash Rent per Acre - $5.00
Comments - Landlord pays taxes

C. Area - 750 acres
Annual Cash Rent - $18,750.00
Type - Irrigated Cropland
Cash Rent per Acre - $25.00
Comments - Landlord pays taxes, furnishes water, and pays all electricity and pumping.

D. Area - 762 acres
Annual Cash Rent - $16,800.00
Type - 440 acres irrigated cropland, 322 acres short pasture
Cash Rent per Acre
  Irrigated - $33.00
  Pasture - $ 3.97

Comments - Landlord pays taxes and furnishes water

E. Area - 3,500 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $11,000.00 - 10 year lease

Type - Short pasture

Cash Rent per Acre - $3.14

Comments - Landlord pays taxes

F. Area - 800 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $7,500.00

Type - 413 acres sub-irrigated pasture, alfalfa, 387 acres short pasture

Cash Rent per Acre - $9.37

Comments - Landlord pays taxes

Summary - Logan County

A. Irrigated Cropland - 1,190 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $33,250.00

Average Cash Rent per Acre - $27.94

B. Sub-irrigated pasture alfalfa - 6,922 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $36,280.00

Average Cash Rent per Acre - $5.38

The following comparisons can be made on Logan County:

	Private Lease	State Lease
Grazing	No Data Available	.497
Dry Farm	No Data Available	2.40
Irrigated Farm	27.94	3.32

The range of prices on public land are as follows:

Logan County

	High	Average Cash Lease	Low
Grazing	1.50*	.497	.20
Dry Farm	3.00	2.40	1.50
Irrigated Farm	5.00	3.32	2.50

The range of prices on private land as ascertained by the Valuation Consultant are as follows:

	High	Average	Low
Grazing	1.25*	.60- .70	.55
Dry Farm	10.94	3.50- 3.75	2.50
Irrigated Farm	50.00	30.00-35.00	25.00

ROUTT COUNTY

Routt County, located in the northwesterly quarter of the state, contains an area of approximately 2,231 square miles. Its eastern boarder is the Continental Divide. The climate is rather severe with long winters and heavy snowfall and short cool summers. The growing season approximates 75 days. The surface of the west and central parts in an extention of a great plateau crossed by the Yampa River, and the eastern border is mountainous. Main tributaries of the Yampa River in Routt county include Elk and Bear Creeks, and Trout, Middle and Fish Creeks with abundantly fertile valleys. Elevations range from 6,230 to about 12,000 feet.

Cash rents are as follows:

A.	Area	-	419 acres
	Annual Cash Rent	-	$3,500.00
	Type	-	Irrigated cropland and pasture
	Cash Rent per Acre		
	Irrigated Cropland	-	82 acres @ $25.42
	Pasture	-	337 acres @ $4.20
	Total	-	$3,500.00
	Comments	-	Landlord pays taxes and furnishes water.

---

*It should be noted here that in this instance State land has a higher income than privately leased land.

The following comparisons can be made in Routt County:

	Private Leased	State Leased
Grazing	No Data Available	.36
Dry Farm	4.20	2.57
Irrigated Farm	25.42	2.75

The range of prices on public school land in Routt County are as follows:

Routt County

	High	Average Cash Lease	Low
Grazing	.82	.36	.15
Dry Farm	3.00	2.578	2.00
Irrigated Farm	3.60	3.175	2.75

The range of prices on private land as ascertained by the Valuation Consultant:

	High	Average	Low
Grazing	1.25	.60- .70	.55
Dry Farm	10.94	3.50- 3.75	2.50
Irrigated Farm	50.00	30.00-35.00	25.00

EL PASO COUNTY

El Paso County, in central Colorado contains a gross area of approximately 2,159 square miles. The surface is mostly a rolling plains area in the east and south, with foothills and mountains in the west and northwest. The timbered covered divide between the tributaries of the Arkansas and South Platte Rivers crosses the northern part of the county from west to east. Elevation ranges from 5,000 feet in the southeast to 14,110 feet at the summit of Pikes Peak, on the county's westerly border. The climate is generally mild and healthful although winters are cold in the mountain areas. The average growing season approximates 146 days. Principal streams are Monument and Fountain Creeks, which converge in Colorado Springs, then join the Arkansas River at Pueblo.

One of the more interesting leasing practices discovered by the writer were those conducted in various areas of El Paso County. According to information furnished the writer, an annual cash rent of ten percent of the appraised value of the land is paid by a lessee to the lessor. The appraised value of the land is established by agreement between the lessor and lessee and is based upon comparable land sales in the area.

Under this agreement, the lessor agrees to payment of real estate taxes and generally the lessee assumes other expenses.

Other cash rents are as follows:

A. Area - 750 acres
Annual Cash Rent - $500.00
Type - Dryland pasture
Cash Rent per Acre - $ .66
Comments - Landlord pays taxes.

The following comparisons can be made in El Paso County:

	Private Lease	State Lease
Grazing	.66	.46
Dry Farm	No Data Available	1.678
Irrigated Farm	No Data Available	No Data Available

The following ranges were observed on public land in El Paso County:

El Paso

	High	Average Cash Lease	Low
Grazing	1.00	.46	.20
Dry Farm	2.00	1.678	1.50
Irrigated Farm	None	None	None

The following ranges on private lands as ascertained by the Valuation Consultant are:

	High	Average	Low
Grazing	1.25	.60- .70	.55
Dry Farm	10.94	3.50- 3.75	2.50
Irrigated Farm	50.00	30.00-35.00	25.00

DOUGLAS COUNTY

Douglas County located in the north central part of the state in the South Platte watershed, has an area of approximately 844 square miles. The climate is dry and comparatively mild with a high percentage of sunshine all year and a growing season of approximately 152 days. In the north and east are level or rolling prairies and pine timbered hills. Much of this area is suitable only for grazing. In the south westerly portion of the county 137,847 acres lie within the Pike National Forest. Elevations range from approximately 5,400 feet northeast to 7,600 feet in the foothills southwest. The westerly boundary is the South Platte River and other streams are Plums and Cherry Creeks in the easterly portion.

Cash rents are as follows:

A. Area - 320 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $3,500.00

Type - Dry cropland
93 acres irrigated

Cash Rent per Acre - $10.94

Comments - Landlord pays taxes, furnishes water and pays pump electricity.

The following comparisons can be made in Douglas County:

	Private Lease	State Lease
Grazing	No Data Available	.46
Dry Farm	10.94 Partial Irrigated Distorsts This	2.687
Irrigated Farm	None	None

The following ranges were observed on public school land in Douglas County:

Douglas County

	High	Average Cash Lease	Low
Grazing	1.00	.46	.15
Dry Farm	3.00	2.687	2.75
Irrigated Farm	None	None	None

The following ranges on private land as ascertained by the Valuation Consultant are as follows:

	High	Average	Low
Grazing	1.25	.60- .70	.55
Dry Farm	10.94	3.50- 3.75	2.50
Irrigated Farm	50.00	30.00-35.00	25.00

CUSTER COUNTY

Custer County, located in the upper Arkansas River in central Colorado is an irregular triangle in shape and contains an area of approximately 738 square miles. The climate is comparatively mild in the valley areas and more severe in the mountains. The surface is level in the wet mountain valley, between the Sangre de Cristo range on the west and the Greenhorn range on the east. Elevations vary from 6,700 feet at the northern boundary to more than 14,000 feet at some of the western peaks. Principal water resources include Grape, Hard Scrabble, Cottonwood, Antelope, Newton, and Oak Creeks.

Cash rents are as follows:

A. Area - 320 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $1,000.00

Type - Dryland

Cash Rent per Acre - $3.12

Comments - Landlord pays taxes and maintains costs up to $250.00/year.

B. Area - 477 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $2,500.00

Type - 205 acres of meadow
25 acres of irrigated pasture
247 acres of dry pasture

Cash Rent per Acre - $5.24

Comments - Landlord pays taxes and maintenance.

No attempt was made to compare income in Custer County, The principal investigator traveled in Custer County and it was ascertained that the public school land in this county is for the most part marginal land. This is revealed in the ranges in income presented below:

Custer County

	High	Average Cash Lease	Low
Grazing	.40	.315	.25
Dry Farm	1.85 (1 lease only)	None	None
Irrigated Farm	None	None	None

Valuation Consultant Summary and Conclusions

Summary

Averages by Land Use Classification

A. Irrigated Cropland - 1,928 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $58,535.00

Average Cash Rent per Acre - $30.36

B. Sub-irrigated pasture, alfalfa - 7,132 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $38,280.00

Average Cash Rent per Acre - $5.37

C. Dry Cropland - 5,080 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $18,500.00

Average Cash Rent per Acre - $3.64

D. Dryland Pasture - 9,324 acres

Annual Cash Rent - $9,870.00

Average Cash Rent per Acre - $1.06

Thus a total of approximately 23,464 acres have been included in this investigation. Interestingly, one thing consistant among landlords is that they feel they can obtain the same rental from their lands whether improved or not. The improved farm has increased overhead with identical gross income hence decreased net income. This results from farm-owner operators desiring supplimental acreage for greater operating efficiency without requiring additional improvements.

CONCLUSIONS

The writer is of the opinion that relatively consistant patterns of leasing practices are apparent in those counties investigated. The cash rental or lease ranges for the land use classifications in the counties investigated are as follows:

Irrigated Cropland	$25.00 per acre	$50.00 per acre
Consistant Range		$30.00 to $35.00 per acre
Sub-Irrigated Pasture, Alfalfa	$ 5.00 per acre	$ 9.52 per acre
Consistant Range		$ 9.00 to $ 9.50 per acre
Dry Cropland	$ 2.50 per acre	$10.94 per acre
Consistant Range		$ 3.50 to $ 3.75 per acre
Dryland Pasture	$ .55 per acre	$ 1.25 per acre
Consistant Range		$ .60 to $ .70 per acre

It should be noted the foregoing ranges exclude payment of real estate taxes by lessors and in certain instances, costs of water, perhaps electricity, etc. Any comparative analysis should consider these factors.

Because this investigation was restricted to studies of private leasing practices, the writer has not included leases between the Colorado State Game and Fish Commission and private ownership. Your further studies may wish to explore these activities in greater detail.

The increasing prices of farm and ranch lands throughout the State of Colorado signifies probable increases in cash rents. Several of the lessors and lessees interviewed indicated they anticipated rises in the immediate future.

Farmer and ranchers in Colorado are experiencing numerous operational and yield problems. The upward trend in land prices and cash rents will, in the writer's opinion, magnify and accelerate future problems.

Part 2. The Conflict Bid

It is appropriate here to give a brief history of the grazing law changes over the past 20 years.

Prior to 1945, every piece of state leased land was on a competitive bid basis. The leased land always went to the highest bidder. In 1945, the law was changed and reads as follows: (Because of the extensive alteration of the law, the entire law is quoted)

A N A C T

RELATING TO STATE LANDS: PROVIDING FOR THE USE AND LEASING THEREOF: AND PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE OF RULES AND REGULATIONS BY THE STATE BOARD OF LAND COMMISSIONERS.

Be It Enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado:

Act Amended

Section 1. Section 58, Chapter 134, 1935 Colorado Statutes Annotated, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Fees for Leases, Patents, Etc.

Section 58. Fees chargeable--Disposition of fees collected. The state board of land commissioners is hereby authorized and empowered to collect the fees herein fixed for the issuance of leases, patents, certificates of purchase, right of way deeds, recording assignments, making township plats, filing bonds, and for the filing of all documents necessary to be filed in said office, to-wit:

Filing application to lease for each 160 acres or fraction thereof...........	$ .50
Filing application to purchase for each 160 acres of fraction thereof.......	.50
Accepting and approving bond...........	1.00
Issuing lease, each 160 acres or fraction thereof.......................	1.00
For each additional 160 acres or fraction thereof in the same lease......	.50
For issuing patent or certificate of purchase, each 160 acres or fraction thereof...........................	2.00
Assignment fee.........................	1.00
Patent for town lot, one or more.......	2.00

Right of way deed, easements, etc.....	5.00
For issuing permission to make improvements in excess of amount allowed by the terms of the lease............	2.00

Certified copies of any instrument or of the records shall be furnished at the rate of 20 cents per folio and $1.00 for the certification.

Each application for lease must be accompanied by a lease service fee of five dollars, in addition to the filing fee.

If the board orders a sale to be made, the applicant shall be required to pay an advertising fee of seventeen dollars.

All township plats shall be furnished at fifty cents each.

For sub-dividing mineral lands into lots of ten acres each for the purpose of leasing, upon application of any person, a deposit of ten dollars for each lot shall be required.

All moneys collected by the state register and deputy in pursuance of any action or resolution of the board, shall be paid into the state treasury, as provided by law.

Fees Paid in Advance

All aforesaid fees shall be paid in advance to the deputy register and be transmitted and accounted for by said deputy to the register of the board, as in the case of other funds, and the said register shall turn the same into the state treasurer, as in the case of money collected for rent and partial payments on certificates of purchase. And it shall be the duty of the State treasurer to receive said funds and credit the same to the land commissioners' cash fund, to be paid out by him on warrants drawn as provided by law, upon vouchers issued by the state board of land commissioners and signed by its president and register.

Act Amended

Section 2. Section 62, Chapter 134, 1935 Colorado Statutes Annotated, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Leases--Sale of Leased Lands

Section 62. Leases--Terms--Renewals--Sale of leased lands. No lease of state or school land for grazing purposes shall be for a longer term than twenty years, and no lease of state or school land for agricultural purposes shall be for a longer period than ten years, except as hereinafter provided. When a lease expires by limitation, the holder thereof may renew the same in the following manner: At any time within ninety days next preceding the expiration of the lease, the lessee, or his assigns, shall notify the register of his desire to renew said lease; if the lessee and the state board agree as to the rental to be paid, a new lease shall be issued; provided, the lessee shall have taken good care of the leased premises and shall have, in good faith, complied with all the requirements of his existing lease; and, provided further, that in determining the maximum amount to be derived therefrom, the board shall consider, among other things, (1) the care and use given the land and the development work done by the lessee in conserving and promoting the productivity thereof and in promoting dependable long term revenue for school purposes, and (2) the classification, location and contribution to the unit controlled by the lessee. Provided, further, that the state board may, in its descretion, offer said land for sale at any time during the term of said lease, upon the same terms and in the same manner as though said lease had not been executed; or it may, in its descretion, withdraw such land from sale during the full term of the lease.

Safety Clause

Section 3. The General Assembly hereby finds, determines and declares that this act is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety.

Emergency

Section 4. In the opinion of the General Assembly an emergency exists; therefore, this act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

Approved: May 5, 1945.

The writer has underlined the section that departs dramatically from the law prior to 1945. This virtually made renewal of leases automatic with no competition unless the lessee wanted to give up the lease to another party. It is alleged that many of these leases were sold to other parties at a profit.

In 1953, the law was again changed. The change however, did not effect the renewal procedure but rather applied a formula to lease rental rates. The law is quoted here. The reader should note Section 112-11-5 as to renewal procedures. This in effect offers automatic renewal.

> 112-11-1. Definitions.--When used in this article:
>
> (1) "Board" shall mean the state board of land commissioners.
> (2) "Animal unit" shall mean one cow or five sheep.
> (3) "Carrying capacity" shall mean the number of animal units which a given tract of land will support during the lease year.
> (4) "Animal-unit-months (AUMs)" shall mean the number of animal units which a given tract of land will support for a specified number of months during a lease year.
> (5) "Lease year" shall mean twelve consecutive months.
> (6) "Cattle price" shall mean the average price of beef cattle for Colorado as determined by the United States department of agriculture for a calendar year.
>
> Source: L. 53, p. 456, § 1.
>
> 112-11-2. Appraisal of carrying capacity. --It will be the duty of the board to rate the carrying capacity of each tract of grazing land owned by the state, in terms of the number of livestock such tract will reasonably support for a lease year, without injury thereto, and consistent with good soil conservation practices. Such carrying capacity shall be expressed in terms of animal-unit-months or AUMs and recorded for each tract of land, in the office of the board. Thereafter, the board shall cause said lands to be reappraised as to their carrying capacity upon the renewal of each lease or at any time that the board in its judgment deems it advisable.
>
> Source: L. 53, p. 456, § 2.

112-11-3. Rental rates.--The board shall establish the per annum rental rate of all state grazing lands on a formula basis, as provided in this article.

Source: L. 53, p. 457, § 3.

112-11-4. Formula--applications.--(1) Said formula shall be based upon:

(a) The base price of cattle in Colorado, which price shall be eight dollars per hundredweight of cattle in Colorado during the period 1933 to 1946, inclusive.

(b) The base rent per animal unit per month shall be fifty cents.

(c) The average price per hundredweight of beef cattle in Colorado for the year preceding the fixing of the rental, which shall be taken by the board from the statistics published by the bureau of agricultural economics of the United States department of agriculture.

(2) In applying the formula, to obtain the rent per animal unit per month for any given year, the base rent per animal unit per month shall be multiplied by the ration of the average price of cattle for the preceding year to the base price of cattle. Or expressed mathematically:

$X:\$0.50 = \text{cattle price}: \$8.00$

X=Rent per animal unit per month for any given year.

Thus, with the average price per hundredweight of cattle in Colorado being approximately twenty-four dollars in 1952, the minimum rental for 1953 may be computed as follows:

$$\frac{X}{.50} = \frac{24}{8}$$

$X=\$1.50$ (rent per animal unit per month).

Source: L. 53, p. 457, § 4.

112-11-5. Existing leases renewed.--As existing leases expire, they shall be renewed under the provisions of this article, if the lessee has satisfactorily fulfilled the obligations of the previous lease contract.

Source: L. 53, p. 457, § 5.

112-11-6. *Adjustments*.--The board is hereby authorized to adjust the resulting price per acre figure in such amount as shall fairly represent any other elements of rental value that may be considered applicable to any particular tract of land.

Source: L. 53, p. 457, § 6.

In 1955, the grazing law was again amended and is the law that currently governs lease procedures in the State of Colorado. It should be noted by the reader that the term "Conflicting bid" is not mentioned in the law. This writer has found no satisfactory explanation for this unusual circumstance. The reader will find sections underscored which is the basis for more than one person to bid on a state school lease.

AN ACT

RELATING TO THE LEASING OF THE PUBLIC LANDS OF THE STATE UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE STATE BOARD OF LAND COMMISSIONERS.

Be It Enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado:

Section 1. 112-3-18, Colorado Revised Statutes 1953, is hereby amended to read as follows:

112-3-18. *Terms of leasing--renewals--sale of leased land*--(1) *The public lands of the state may be leased by the state board of land commissioners, and if so leased shall be leased in such manner and to such persons as will produce an optimum long-term revenue*. No lease of such lands for grazing or agricultural purposes shall be for a longer period than ten years.

In determining the maximum benefit to the state in the renewal of any expiring lease, the board shall consider, among other things, the care and use given the land and the development work done by the lessee in conserving and promoting the productivity thereof and in promoting optimum long-term revenue for school purposes, and the classification, location and contribution to the unit controlled by the lessee.

Before land shall be leased to anyone other than the present lessee said present lessee shall be given ten days to negotiate with the state board of land commissioners concerning a new lease.

(2) Prior to the quarter period beginning April 1, 1955, and prior to each quarter period thereafter, the board shall make a listing of all leases which will expire within the second succeeding quarter period thereafter, giving a description of the land leased, the name of the lessee and the expiration date of the lease. At least five days prior to the beginning of each such quarter period, a copy of such listing shall be certified to and transmitted by the board to the county clerk of each county in which any such land to be leased is situated, and shall by said county clerk, immediately upon receipt thereof, be posted in the court house in a conspicuous place to which the public shall have access, and kept so posted until all leases listed thereon shall have expired. A copy of such quarterly listing shall also be posted at the times above provided in the main office of the state board of land commissioners at the state capitol, available for public inspection.

(3) All applications to lease or to renew a lease shall be made in writing to the board, stipulating the rental the applicant is willing to pay and under such other regulations, not in conflict with the law, as the board may prescribe.

The board shall require from any applicant for a lease that he give evidence of his responsibility to carry out the terms of the lease. Any applicant except the present lessee shall deposit with his application a sum of money equal to the first annual rental offered in his application.

The board shall also require that an applicant state under oath the total acreage of agricultural or grazing land, if any, owned and to be operated by him in connection with the land to be leased, and (a) the intended use, during the term of the lease, of both such private land, if any, and public land, either as to agricultural products to be produced thereon, or as to the carrying capacity of such lands in terms of the number of livestock such tracts are expected to reasonably support; and (b) if a renewal, a history, for such period of time as prescribed by the board, of the past use of both such private land, if any, and public land, as to agricultural products produced and the number of livestock grazed thereon.

(4) The board may, in its discretion, offer for sale any land leased at any time during the term of the lease as though said lease had not been executed, or it may withdraw such land from sale during the full term of the lease.

(5) The board shall have power to cancel and terminate any lease at any time if it finds that a lessee has violated any of the provisions of the lease or made any false statement in his application therefor.

(6) The board shall as soon as practicable, and not more than thirty days after the close of every quarter period, post, in the main office of the board, a complete listing of leases executed during that quarter period, together with rental figures for same.

Section 2.--Sections repealed--112-11-1 to 112-11-6, Colorado Revised Statutes 1953, are hereby repealed.

Section 3.--First quarterly listing--The quarter period listing for leases expiring within the quarter period listing for leases expiring within the quarter beginning July 1, 1955, shall be prepared, transmitted

> and posted pursuant to the provisions of Section 112-3-18 (2) as herein amended, five days prior to April 1, 1955, or fifteen days after the date of approval of this act by the governor, whichever is the later.
>
> Section 4.--Safety Cause--The General Assembly hereby finds, determines and declares that this act is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety.
>
> Approved: April 19, 1955

This law also repealed the so called "formula law" which apparently proved very unpopular.

Again, the State Board of Land Commissioners have been granted broad discretionary powers to decide what will produce "an optimum long term revenue." This has given rise to instances where the State Board of Land Commissioners have come under severe criticism. The following incident is an example. This account appeared in a newspaper article in 1963.

> Record Land Bid Turned Down
> Tuesday, May 21, 1963 by Bert Hanna DPSW
>
> Culminating a bitter range war of many years, the State Board of Land Commissioners Tuesday turned down the highest bid ever received for leasing of state school lands in an area of Las Animas and Otero Counties.
>
> The action meant defeat for Glen (Bull) Watkins, 71 year old Model, Colorado rancher, who has fought for years to obtain land leased by neighbors.
>
> Instead of accepting Watkin's high offer and $20,000 deposit on 4,480 acres, the board continued the lease of the present occupants and set the rate at 45 cents an acre. This would yield $2,016 per year.[1]

In addition to the $20,000 deposit the contesting bidder also offered $.50 per acre as rent for a 10 year period or an income of $2,240 per year.

A hearing was held on this conflicting bid on May 16, 1963. The State Board of Land Commissioners have given this writer a complete transcript of that hearing and perhaps a portion of that document will reveal further information on this seeming error in promoting income to the schools in Colorado.

---

[1] Denver Post, May 21, 1963.

First, the transcript of the hearing reveals deep and bitter personal feeling between two ranch families. But, more important than this, there are economic considerations that had to be dealt with in a realistic manner. There are two statements made by witnesses at that hearing that are significant to the decision that was made by the State Board of Land Commissioners.

The first statement is by Mr. Henry C. Hall of Hall & Hall, a Farm Loan manager.

Mr. Hall: "I have a statement to read and file with the Court. We negotiate farm and ranch loans for the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Company and the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company. Since 1946, in the last 17 years, our firm has been the direct means of bringing 35 million dollars of money (sic) into our state. This isn't a staggering amount when compared with budgets for our state or nation, but it does add an appreciable amount to the velocity and cash flow of Colorado agricultural economy.

The Collateral Assignment of State Land Board leases in the negotiation of Life Insurance Company loans has for years added a tangible amount of money to this volume and has been considered by most lenders a safe security. This is true because the prudent administration of State Land Board's leasing policy has provided the lessee with a security of tenure upon which he could plan his agricultural and livestock enterprise for more than one year. This equitable and wise leasing policy also gives real assurance to lenders, making loans for 20 or 25 years, that their borrowers will not lose a valuable part of their productive source through ruthless, capricious or mischievous changes in policy.

Any revolutionary changes in State Land Board leasing policies which limits or undermines the security of tenure will, no doubt, make a difference in lending policies of most sources of agricultural credit."

The second statement is by a Mr. A. B. Smith, a rancher, operating in Kansas and Colorado.

Mr. Smith: "Naturally, as a ranch owner and lessee, we have a very vital interest in the methods and the general policy of the Land Board. I am a little bit like Bob Johnson, I can't understand how anyone can look at that map and see how one could put a

> terrific value on that land, how he could even use it at an ordinary value; I don't see how he could even use it if it was (sic) given to him. There has to be some kind of motive back of it. It seems to me, looking at it from a lessee's standpoint, I mean all the lessees of state land in Colorado, that they should have something more than the mere monetary return on this land. There should be a relationship between the Land Board, or landlord; we call them landlords because they handle the land. The lessee is the tenant. There should be some relationship that the lessee should have some protection from whatever this motive is.(sic) It looks to me like it's the motive to go out and ruin. Now I am not acquainted with either party, but we know this has gone beyond the economic value of grass and return of grass. If something like this is condoned and the dollar is the only consideration, I just don't know where that leaves the policy or leaves the lessee of any state land.
> ...Somebody is going to get hurt, regardless of which way it goes and it looks to me like there is some motive--a motive to ruin--a motive to hurt someone--would be back of this proposition, lease proposition.(sic) It looks to me like it is almost to the point of extortion to expect a person, ask a person to come up and meet something as unreasonable as that is when there is no economic basis whatsoever. I think it goes beyond this one case, it seems to me that the action taken here would set the precedence--it would govern the leasing of all the state land in the state.(sic)"

Embodied in these two statements are the principal reasons that the State Board of Land Commissioners returned the land to the original lessee for a reduced figure and turned down the increase in revenue.

The reasons can be summarized thusly:

1. This case had degenerated into a "grudge battle" between two ranch families. Further, many of the conflicting bids are of this emotional nature.

2. A rancher must have a certain degree of security in his operation in order to borrow capital and insure a long term operation.

3. The overall economy of the state must be considered when leasing state land.

4. To automatically turn over land to the highest bidder may in the long term prove to be a diseconomy rather than an revenue producer.

5. Many times a conflict will be filed against only the more desirable part of a given plot of land. For example, a conflict may be filed only against a level portion of grazing land or against a portion with the only water. This may render a larger portion undesirable or uneconomical to operate. Therefore, it is the judgement of the State Board of Land Commissioners that they must reserve the right to make a total evaluation of any conflict of bid.

In resolving the conflict bid, the State Board of Land Commissioners have therefore taken a number of factors under consideration. It appears on the basis of the evidence that is presented in this work that the board has used sound judgement in resolving the conflict bid. In most conflicts investigated, the school fund did not lose money and when the fund did not realize the greater revenue it was because a larger block of land was involved and a larger consideration was felt necessary.

The principal investigator reviewed every conflict bid since that law was passed in 1955. Since that date 253,477.79 acres have had a conflicting bid filed. Of this amount only 13,574.54 acres have been turned over to someone other than the present lessee. In most cases the present lessee met the bid offered by the contesting applicant. The other prevailing reason for returning the lease to the present lessee was reluctance on the part of the board to break-up an operating unit. The reader will find in Appendix C a complete record of all conflicting bids and how they were resolved by the State Board of Land Commissioners.

Part 3. The Sublease

The writer could find little attention given to the practice of subleasing prior to 1955. Historically, subleasing of state land seemed to be accepted as a matter of fact.

In 1955, the State Board of Land Commissioners issued a bulletin, a portion of which dealt with the practice of subleasing. A portion of this bulletin also discusses and recapitulates the narrative written concerning the law in Part 2 of this work.

BULLETIN

May 27, 1955

As we are now operating under our new grazing law no doubt many are wondering what effect, if any, this will have on their leases. Generally speaking, about all the new law does is repeal the so-called Formula law passed in 1953, and puts the leasing procedure back to where it was under the 1945 law, which means negotiation between the lessee and the Board, through its field representatives. About the only exception to that is the fact that we are now required to post in the county clerk's office of each county a list of all leases expiring for each quarter, such list to be posted at least 90 days before the beginning of the quarter, thus allowing other interested parties an opportunity to apply for lease on the lands listed in these notices.

The Land Board did not write this law, but we believe we can do a good and fair job for both the lessees and the schools, who are the owners of the land. The law was not designed to raise or lower any rentals, but to let the rentals seek their economic level, based upon supply and demand. The law was the result of negotiations carried on through a number of meetings by various representatives of educational groups and land users, and we think the representatives of the livestock industry have done a good job in protecting the interests of the lessees. The law directs the Board to take into consideration previous use and care of the land, and the present lessee is given the right to meet any offer made by someone else.

We have adopted a few regulations as follows:

1. We will not be obligated to consider any offer or application made for any land unless it is received at least 60 days prior to the expiration of the existing lease. This is in order to get renewals completed promptly, and we must insist that lease and bond papers be returned promptly along with the first year's rental and fees.

2. An application from anyone other than the existing lessee must be accompanied by the filing fees and first year's rental in advance, the rental being based on the applicant's bid on a per acre basis.

3. Subleasing land will automatically cause loss of priority or preference right of the previous lessee to a renewal, and at the expiration of the existing lease the land will be advertised and leased to the high bidder. Pasturing of cattle belonging to other than the lessee will not necessarily be considered subleasing, but if that is the only ranching business the lessee engaged in, perhaps a renewal would be closely scrutinized under the provisions of "past use of the land."

4. As you know, for the past two years while we were operating under the recent law we collected a consideration for approving an assignment at two and one-half times one year's rent. We felt this was justified because the party taking the lease was assured of a renewal. Under the new law the holder of a lease has the preference right of being able to meet the high bid, but we do not

> feel he receives quite so much when he takes over a lease on an assignment, so we are reducing that consideration to one year's rental. When we were collecting two and one-half times an annual rental we took up the old lease and issued a new one so that the assignee had protection for five years; but under the present law that would not work as we are required to post expiration dates in the court houses, and if we arbitrarily issue a new lease for five years, where the old one only had a year or two to run, it would be contrary to law as it would deprive any prospective applicant from his right to make an application for land he desires to lease. Furthermore, under our present procedure on subleasing, if a person taking over a lease does not wish to pay the one year's rental in return for the right to meet a higher bid, he can hold it under a sublease until the expiration of the current lease and then take his chance at auction. This gives him a choice.

Apparently this release did not alter the rather widespread practice of subleasing. Evidence to support this view is found in a news release dated in February of 1965. The Board admitted that their policy had been confusing:

> "For years there has been misunderstanding and confusion as to the Board's policy on subleasing. Perhaps no question has come up more often and caused more trouble. Much of this difficulty has come from doubts as to what we considered subleasing. Bulletins put out by the Board five or six years ago seem to have confused the situation, rather than clarified it. In order to prevent misunderstanding in the future, the Board has now arrived at a firm policy which will appear in a new bulletin, superceding all others, to be mailed to all lessees in March."

In March the policy referred to in this release, was mailed to all lessees. It read as follows:

BULLETIN NO. 11

March 1, 1965

There has been a change in the membership of the Land Board since our last bulletin.

Howard M. Shults of Grand Junction, Colorado, replaced Mr. Kelley Jackson in January 1963.

Raymond H. Simpson of Cope, Colorado, replace Mr. Arthur M. Ramsey in January 1965

The Board now consists of the following members.

Raymond H. Simpson	President
Howard M. Shults	Register
Wesley E. Woodward	Engineer

For practical purposes the General Policies of the Land Board will remain the same as in the past with the exception of the following clarification on subleasing.

SUBLEASING

As of May 1, 1965 all leases must be held in the name of the actual user. Due to the many complaints we are receiving on the subleasing of state land we are compelled to set definite rules and regulations on this practice. It is the decision of the State Board of Land Commissioners that Paragraph 4, Page 2 of all surface leases be enforced -- which states: "Subleasing during any part of this lease term will automatically cause loss of priority or preference right to renewal." (All leases now read that subleasing may be cause for cancellation at any time.)

It is the opinion of the Land Board that if anyone other than the lessee is using state land for any purpose the lease is being violated.

The only exception to this order is that pasturing livestock on shares, by the month or on a gain basis, will be permitted providing the lessee owns fifty per cent or more of the livestock on the lease, and is in control at all times of use, fences, water, etc.

Leases may be assigned to a second party at a cost equal to one year's rent, and a collateral may be recorded to retain the lease with the ranch with which it is used and to insure the return of the lease to the original lessee, when necessary.

Further, the practice of subleasing was defined as:

Subleasing in any way, either all or part of a state surface lease, is a violation of the terms of that lease, and is reason for cancellation of the lease. Any of the following practices are defined as subleasing:

1. Leasing a farm or ranch and permitting the tenant to use the state land either free or for compensation.

2. Pasturing livestock by the day, month or year on a fee basis where the lessee does not have direct charge of the state land and it is not run in connection with the lessees private property by the lessee.

3. Pasturing livestock belonging to another party on a gain or share basis where the lessee is not in direct control

of the land and it is not run in connection with the lessees private property by the lessee.

4. Leasing agricultrue land to anyone for cash or on a share basis.

If anyone other than the lessee is using any part of the lands leased from the state, the lessee should report the exact arrangement for the use of the Land Board. The Board will determine whether the reported use is a violation of the lease.

As a result of this firm policy on subleasing the following lease assignments were completed in March, April and May of 1965.

MONTH	NO. OF ASSIGNMENTS	FEES
March	3	$ 901
April	45	19,346
May	50	28,892

Most of the lessees involved here were either ignorant of the law or were violating the law without intent. This has now been corrected.

The subleasing that is currently taking place is more difficult to control. One member of the Board told this writer that he knows the practice of subleasing is still going on but "we are catching up with them more everyday."

It appears that the policy is working well and the land board now has a firmer administrative control of the public school land in relationship to the practice of subleasing.

There is one other area that should be mentioned at this time. Technically, it is not called a sublease by the board. However, the problem is closely allied to subleasing and will be reviewed at this point.

While gathering data for Part 1, Chapter IV of this work, the writer found an unusual lease in the "County Card file" at the State Land Board. The lease was granted for duck hunting privileges and further was granted on a section already being leased for grazing purposes.

This practice has long been the goal of sportsmen in Colorado and other western states. Evidence to support this view is found in an article in the Denver Post of January 1965.

MULTIPLE USE
MANAGER'S GOAL

by Cal Queal

The State Land Board has a new manager,

> and the Colorado Wildlife Federation hopefully proposes that the board's future operations be conducted with more of an eye to multiple use.
>
> It's been common practice for grazing lessees to get state school lands at bargain rates and post them against hunting, fishing and other recreation use. Some three million acres of such land represents a sizeable reservoir from which could be drawn raw material to serve Colorado's growing demand for outdoor livingroom.
>
> Andy Christiansen of Wheat Ridge, president of the federation, explains that there's no reason the school property shouldn't be managed on a multiple use principle, the same as other public lands.
>
> "Leases for grazing should be drawn to allow provisions for recreation," says Christiansen. "They belong to everyone in the state, but have often been treated as private property by the people who lease them.
>
> "I fully realize there are instances where recreation use of such lands would be impractical. A man with a wheat field, for example, couldn't be expected to allow his crop to be run over by the public. Grazing land is quite another thing. On public land, it could be and should be opened to public recreation.
>
> "Also, lessees should be granted on a competitive bid basis--a rule that has been abused in the past."

This writer could find only two such leases granted for hunting purposes. There also appears to be some confusion as to what policies are being followed with these hunting leases. This confusion has led one member of the State Board of Land Commissioners to write the following memorandum to the office file: (See following two pages)

At this writing the questions posed in the document just quoted are pending.

S-31537
2 cc to WEW
General file

December 26, 67

Office File

Wesley E. Woodward

Hunting Lease S-31537

Hunting Lease S-31537

Originally issued Oct. 25, 1960
to
Henry Swan II

For: 640 acres (Sec. 4, T. 4 N., R. 62 W.) Weld County
Rental: $50 per year
Term: 20 years, until Dec. 31, 1980.

Provisions: ".....for the sole purpose of hunting by party of the second part and his guests......"
"Lessee.......agrees to exercise due care to prevent injury or damage to livestock, fences, crops, improvements, rights-of-way and irrigation system belonging to surface lessee, and agrees to pay for any and all injury or damage to property of lessee."

Application made on Dec. 4, 1967 by Henry Swan to add 40 acres (NE-SW Sec. 15, T. 4 N., R. 62 W.) to the lease. Rental rate to be changed from $50 to $75 per year, as of 12-8-67. Board order approving these changes signed by president and register.

Comments of Engineer:

I do not disapprove of this lease. In fact, I think there is the possibility of increasing income to the school fund by this kind of leasing. It seems to me, though, that some definite policy on hunting (or other recreational use) lease should be agreed on and put in practice. This should be discussed and a number of questions answered before the policy is set; such as these:

Is all state land open to hunting and fishing leases? Are they to be issued on top of present grazing and agricultural leases? If so, will the consent and agreement of the present lessee be required? Would we consider this kind of lease to be for a higher and better use and good cause to cancel grazing leases? My main concern is to establish a firm policy as to when and where such leases are to be issued. How is the rental rate to be determined?

I believe there are only two of these leases in existence and, I suppose, they were granted under some special conditions. What conditions? I wonder, if these leases were publicized, if we wouldn't get many applications for them, especially on mountain and river valley lands.

It seems to me that it would be wise to check with other states and the federal government as to their procedures and policies on hunting leases.

Wesley E. Woodward
Wesley E. Woodward

WEW:ish

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Many influences surround land usage and management on Colorado public school lands. Specifically these influences are:

1. philosophy
2. unbalanced distribution of school land over the state
3. non-resident lessees
4. non-payment of taxes on school lands
5. ad-valorum taxes on improvements
6. mineral deposits
7. sub-leasing practices
8. land appraisal methods
9. duration of leases
10. conflicting bids on leases
11. timber contracts
12. access problems
13. lease rate policies
14. appreciation of land values
15. recreational potential
16. multiple use

The focal point of concern in this research has been leasing practices in Colorado with a view to clarify existing practices in three problem areas; fee scheduling, conflict bids and subleasing.

Technically all three areas involve fee scheduling and like sales of public land cause emotional involvement when talking to the land user or land beneficiary. There have been prepared over the years nearly as many fee schedules as there are states leasing school lands. There have been sliding scales tied to productivity, open bidding on leases, livestock price adjustment scales, simple scales, complex formula scales and simple negotiation. Prior to the development of this research, the nearly universal thought this writer obtained from the beneficiaries to the land was that rental rates were "too low." Further, that lease renewal was automatic and subleasing with subsequent loss of revenue to schools was widespread.

On the basis of the evidence presented in this brief study, the following results and conclusions have been drawn.

1. Cash rentals on public school grazing land in this study compare favorably with cash rental revenue from private grazing lands of comparable use and topography. While the

school land revenue was slightly less, such economic contengencies as taxes, water development, electricity, and length of lease on private property make the ranges of revenue comparable.

2. Cash rentals on state grazing land appear to be equitable to the school fund and to the rancher/farmer. It was found during the course of this study that in many counties studied, the State of Colorado retains grazing land that is not as good in quality as privately held contigous land. Stated conversely, Colorado continues to sell state land of better quality while there is little demand for marginal land. This practice has caused some low rentals in certain counties (Logan County .20, Routt County .15) where much of the land is of poor quality.

3. On dry land farm areas the State Board of Land Commissioners appear to be setting rates comparable with private leased land of similar use. Where there are large differences in rental ranges, real estate taxes, length of lease, cost of water, fencing and electricity generally account for these differences.

4. The greatest difference in rental rate comparisons in the study appear in the area of irrigated farming. The range in rentals on private irrigated land was $25.00 - $50.00 per acre with a consistant range of $30.00 - $35.00 per acre. On State irrigated land rentals in the areas studied rarely exceed $6.00 per acre with a consistant range of $3.50 - $5.00 per acre.

The explanation for this can be found in the fact that through the years the State Board of Land Commissioners have not made an effort to protect state water rights and encourage water development on State land.

In December of 1966 the State Board of Land Commissioners issued the following comments in relation to water development:

> WATER DEVELOPMENT - STATE LAND
>
> Through the years the State Land Board has, apparently, failed to file on, or otherwise protect, the water rights in flowing streams on state land. As a result, lessees and adjoining owners have acquired almost all these rights and the state lands are nearly all dependent on privately owned rights for water. It is now too late to do anything about these surface water rights.
>
> However, in the last few years new legislation on ground water (underground water) has stimulated much activity in establishing water wells and the Board has become increasingly concerned about retaining the ownership, and of developing, ground water on school land.

In order to protect ownership the following clause has been inserted in all recent leases:

> "If the lessee shall initiate or establish any water right for the leased premises, for which the point of surface diversion or ground water withdrawal is on the leased premises, such right shall, upon termination of the lease, become the property of the lessor without cost."

Although this clause in the lease may protect the state's ownership of ground water it does nothing to encourage development of water resources on state Land.

The Board has realized that inactivity in regard to water development would allow adjoining owners to develop the water of a basin by placing wells all around the state land and leaving the state land dry. If there is water in or under the state land, it should be developed in order to increase the value of the land.

Accordingly, the Board has made a preliminary study of the possibilities of water production on state land. As a result of this study it was determined that an area in Weld County, north of Roggen, whould be the pilot project for water development. This area was chosen because there appeared to be an unusually large untapped reservoir of ground water there, because the water table is near the surface, because there is no flowing surface stream to complicate the water situation, and because the state controlled most of the land in the basin, none of which was developed for agriculture.

The state was fortunate in being able to make an agreement with Page T. Jenkins, a Wyoming geologist, to explore the area and to develop it. A total of 6,243 acres was included in a "Water Exploration Lease" under which Mr. Jenkins was to core drill, analyze the soil and water, make engineering studies, and otherwise test the possibilities of ground water.

The lease provided that if the lessee should develop sufficient underground water for irrigation purposes, he was to be granted an agricultural lease on the irrigable land. The agricultural lease was to be for a term of ten years and would contain an "immunity" clause, protecting the lessee from sale of the land during that period. Mr. Jenkins was to pay - and paid - 50¢ per acre for the "exploration lease". This lease was granted in October, 1966, to run for a term of three years at 50¢ per acre per year.

Upon obtaining the "Exploration Lease" Mr. Jenkins engaged a hydrologist to begin the work, and soon after

> applied to the State Engineer for well permits in the area.
>
> At this time it appeared that the surface lessees who had the land for grazing only were much disturbed by the probable development. It would mean, of course, that land which could be irrigated by wells would be withdrawn from the grazing leases when it became agricultural land. Opposition to the project grew among the grazing lessees and neighbors. No permits were issued by the State Engineer. After three months of fruitless negotiations and continued delay on the permits, it looked as though the water development on state land was stalled.
>
> Finally, in early January, 1967, Mr. Frank Mann, who held most of the land under a grazing lease, indicated his willingness to take over Mr. Jenkin's exploration lease and to proceed with the development as Mr. Jenkins had planned. Jenkins agreed to this and at the present time the exploration lease is being assigned to Mr. Mann.
>
> It is hoped that the necessary well permits will now be issued by the State Engineer and that a large part of this tract will be under irrigation in the future. The results of this project will determine the Board's methods and policies in other areas where some ground water may be developed. There are many isolated sections of school land in Yuma, Kit Carson, and Washington Counties, with water wells nearby, which will remain dry land sections unless the state can secure well development in the near future. Lessees and others will be encouraged to enter into some agreement with the Board for this development.[1]

At this writing no further information is available. Presumably, the water on the private land is responsible for the great difference in rental rates. However, this is the basis for further study and there is insufficient evidence in this study to make a conclusion.

5. The State Board of Land Commissioners have broad powers in resolving the conflict bid. On the basis of the information obtained in this study, the Board has been exercising prudent judgment when resolving the conflict bid. This does not always mean an immediate increase in revenue. However, these decisions must necessarily take into consideration the long term return on public school land. It is therefore con-

---

[1] Activities of Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners for the Month of December 1966. Board of Land Commissioners, State of Colorado. Denver, 1966. pp. 1-3

cluded that the Land Board should retain this flexible policy and power to arbitrate the conflicting bid.

6. The policies concerning subleasing practices have been defined and delineated much more clearly since 1965. The subleasing that is currently being carried on is difficult to control. The Board however, does have firm control of the practice and when it is discovered appropriate administrative steps are taken to (1) correctly list the lease to the proper lessee or (2) cause the current lessee to lose priority on preference right to renewal.

7. Subleasing land for other purposes is currently being carried out by the State Board of Land Commissioners. Technically, this is more of a "multiple use principle" than a sublease. Hunting leases are being granted to at least two parties on land that has been leased to other parties for grazing. It appears that the board has no firm policy on this matter and there is no indication what policies the administrative body intends to follow.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BULLETINS

Activities of Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners for the Month of December 1966. Board of Land Commissioners, State of Colorado. Denver, 1966.

General Bulletin No. 2, Board of Land Commissioners, State of Colorado. Denver, October 14, 1955.

Public School Lands in Colorado. Report to the General Assembly: Colorado Legislative Council, Research No. 47, Denver, 1960.

Roberts, N. K. and Wennergner, E. B. The Economics of Selecting and Administring State Lands for Grazing Use, Bulletin 443, Agriculture Experiment Station, Utah State University, Logan, 1963.

B. LAWS AND ACTS

Colorado Revised Statues, 1945.
Colorado Revised Statues, 1955.
Colorado Revised Statues, 1966.

C. NEWSPAPERS

Denver Post (editorial), 1960.
Hanna, Bert. "Record Land Bid Turned Down," Denver Post, May 21, 1963.
Queal, Cal. "Multiple Use Manager's Goal," Denver Post, January 19, 1965.

APPENDIX A

Letter of Transmittal
Vita of Valuation Consultant

January 5, 1968

Dr. Stanley M. Cole
Education Department
Liberal Arts
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Dear Sir:

In accordance with your request, I have conducted an investigation into the leasing practices of privately owned farm and ranch properties in designated areas of Colorado.

Transmitted herewith is the information compiled in conjunction with the aforementioned investigation. Interviews were conducted with bankers and other mortgage lenders, lessors, lessees and assessors to ascertain the cash rents paid for privately owned properties in the areas investigated. In accord with your instructions, except for lessors or lessees, no attempt was made to validate the accuracy of the information.

In further accord with your instructions, no specific conclusions were adopted relative to the market or lease value of individual properties. Rather the information contained herein forms lease value ranges from which comparative analysis may be commenced.

Respectfully submitted,

Harold A. Jungbluth

Harold A. Jungbluth

QUALIFICATIONS OF THE VALUATION CONSULTANT

The writer has engaged in the valuation of residential, commercial, industrial, ranch and special purpose properties for transfer of ownership, condemnation, mortgage loan, ad valorem tax and other purposes since 1947 and has ten years concurrent experience in mortgage financing.

Valuation services have been rendered for the following:

Businesses -

Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Company
The Ohio National Life Insurance Company
Western Electric Company
Westinghouse Electric Company
Continental Oil Company
United States Steel Corporation
Humble Oil Company
General Mills, Inc.
International Business Machine Corporation
Insurance Company of North America
Martin-Marietta Company
ITT - Bell & Grossett, Inc.
Univac, Division of Sperry Rand Corporation
Gulf Oil Company
New York Life Insurance Company

Governmental Agenices -

United States of America - General Services Administration
State of Colorado - Department of Institutions
City of Golden, Colorado
City of Aurora, Colorado
City of Fort Collins, Colorado

Banks -

Denver-United States National Bank, Denver, Colorado
First National Bank of Denver, Colorado
First National Bank in Golden, Colorado
Poudre Valley National Bank, Fort Collins, Colorado
Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, New York
Central Bank and Trust Company, Denver, Colorado
First National Bank in Fort Collins, Colorado

QUALIFICATIONS OF THE VALUATION CONSULTANT (CON'T)

Savings and Loan Associations -

Silver State Savings and Loan Association -
Denver, Colorado
Golden Savings and Loan Association -
Golden, Colorado
Great West Savings and Loan Association -
Boulder, Colorado
Fort Collins Federal Savings and Loan Association -
Fort Collins, Colorado

Others -

Real Estate firms, private clients, individual investors and attorney's at law

Instructor at the University of Colorado, Extension Division, Adult Education, in Land Economics and Real Estate Appraisal

Member of -

American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers

Society of Real Estate Appraisers
President - Denver Chapter #9 - 1961

Fort Collins Board of Realtors

Faculty of appraisal courses sponsered by the Society of Real Estate Appraisers at North Dakota State University.

Guest lecturer at various conferences and seminars throughout the United States.

Qualified expert witness on real estate values in many Colorado District and County Courts.

APPENDIX B

Form for Lease of State Lands

LEASE OF STATE LANDS

No..............................

THIS INDENTURE, Made in duplicate and entered into at the City and County of Denver and State of Colorado, this.................... day of.., in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred.., by and between the State of Colorado, acting through its **State Board of Land Commissioners,** hereinafter designated as the lessor, and.. of.., State of Colorado, hereinafter designated as the lessee. Wherever the word "lessee" appears in the printed portion of this contract, it is intended to and does refer to the lessee(s) named above, whether one or more in number, and the word "lessee" is also understood to include heirs, assigns, successors or legal representatives.

Witnesseth: That the lessor, for and in consideration of the covenants and agreements herein set forth, to be kept and performed by the lessee, has by virtue of the statutes in such case made and provided, demised and leased to the lessee the right and privilege for grazing purposes or agricultural purposes as hereinafter indicated to the following described lands, situate, lying and being in the County of.., in said State, the same being known and described as follows, viz.:

The above lands to be used as follows:

For grazing purposes ....acres
For agricultural purposes ....acres

1—This lease is subject to any and all easements or rights of way heretofore legally obtained and now in full force and effect, if any there be.

Reserving, however, to the State of Colorado:

a. The right to order the sale of all or any portion of said premises during the term hereof, ... The lessor shall, if sale is ordered, give to the lessee thirty (30) days' notice by mail of the date, time and place of sale. In the event said premises, or any part thereof, are sold this lease shall thereby be cancelled as to that portion or all of such lands sold, from which date the lessee shall have thirty (30) days to vacate the premises sold. Provided, that lessee shall have the right to reenter said premises to cultivate, care for and harvest any crops planted by him prior to the termination of his right to possession, except that this proviso shall not apply to crops which normally produce harvestable yields for more than one year after the planting thereof; crops which normally produce harvestable yields for more than one year after the planting thereof, and benefits to the land by reason of summer fallowing or cultivating the same in preparation for the planting of a crop not actually planted at the time of termination of the right to possession will be considered improvements and appraised as such by the Board in the same manner as is provided for, under sub-paragraph "d" of Paragraph 6 of this lease.

b. The right to lease all or any portion of said premises for mineral purposes, together with such surface rights as may be necessary for operation under such mineral lease.

c. The right to sell all or any portion of the timber upon said premises, and to grant to the purchaser of such timber the right of entry to remove same.

d. The right to cancel this lease on that part of the land granting the use for grazing purposes only, upon thirty (30) days' notice by mail, whenever an application shall have been made to lease all or any portion of said grazing land for agricultural purposes.

e. The right to hold, appropriate, sell or otherwise dispose of any fences or other improvements of any character, and growing crops and removable machinery upon said premises, to insure the payment of any delinquent rentals due the state, or any other claims of the lessor on account of damages, expenses incurred or otherwise.

f. The right at any time to grant a right-of-way upon, over or across said premises for any ditch, reservoir, railroad, pipe line, public highway, telegraph, telephone or power line, school house or other lawful purpose.

g. The right to use or lease said premises or any part thereof, at any time, for any purpose other than the rights and privileges herein specifically granted.

h. The right to cancel this lease upon giving ten (10) days' notice by mail to the lessee whenever it appears to the satisfaction of the lessor that the lessee has failed to take good care of the leased premises or any part thereof, including state-owned improvements thereon, has overgrazed the grass land, or has failed to otherwise use said land in conformity with good soil conservation practices.

i. Reserving all rights and privileges of every and whatsoever kind or nature not herein specifically granted.

2—To Have and To Hold, The above described premises, with the appurtenances, for the purposes herein granted, unto the lessee from the..............................day of.., A.D. 19.........., for the term of five (5) years, being until the..............................day of.., A.D. 19.........., subject to the covenants and agreements herein set forth.

a. That the lessee shall pay to the lessor, at the office of the State Board of Land Commissioners, Capitol Building, Denver, Colorado, the sum of.. Dollars ($....................) as rental each and every year, in advance, during the term of this lease.

b. That the lessee shall execute a good and sufficient bond, with sureties to be approved by the said State Board of Land Commissioners, for the payments of the rentals due the lessor, and the faithful performance of all the covenants and agreements in this lease herein provided, and in accordance with the provisions of the statutes of the State of Colorado.

3—That no assignment of this lease shall be valid unless it shall have been entered upon the records of and approved by the State Board of Land Commissioners and payment of assignment consideration made. Any assignment of this lease shall in no way release the lessee and his bondsmen or surety bonding company from liability to the lessor. The lessee shall be liable for any damage caused by over-grazing, or by any other use inconsistent with good soil conservation practices.

4—Subleasing during any part of lease term will automatically cause loss of priority or preference right to renewal.

5—That the lessee shall not permit any loss or damage, nor commit, cause or allow to be committed, any injury, waste, in, to, or upon said premises, or any part thereof, nor use the same, except for the purposes herein granted and in accord with good soil conservation practices; and shall not cut or remove, or allow to be cut or removed, any timber, standing trees, or dead and down timber or wood fuel that may now be upon said premises (except as hereinafter provided); and that a failure to preserve and protect the live or dead and down timber on said premises from cutting or removal will subject this lease to cancellation.

It Being Provided, However, That the lessee may use such dead and down timber as may be required for his domestic use on said premises only, and such dead and down timber as may be used for fence posts and corrals, in the improvement of the land herein described.

6—That no improvements shall be placed by the lessee upon or made upon the land herein leased for which payment can be required to be made by any purchaser or other lessee of the land, except in the manner and as hereinafter provided, to-wit:

a. Improvements other than cattle fences and livestock watering facilities shall be permitted only upon the filing with the lessor of an Improvement Permit Application to be furnished by the lessor, in which application shall be set forth all improvements of any kind or character which may be upon the land, or which the lessee may desire to put upon the land and have attached as improvements to the land herein described, which Improvement Permit Application shall be duly filed in duplicate copies with the State Board of Land Commissioners for its consideration, appraisement, consent and approval.

b. That any of such improvements allowed by the lessor under said Improvement Permit Application to be placed upon the premises, shall become permanently attached thereto, and shall become a part of the realty.

c. The lessee shall attach as an improvement to the leased premises any water rights owned by him and used in connection with said premises. All water rights shall be transferred to the lessor.

d. That any authorized improvements shall be subject to sale at the appraised value, to be fixed and determined by the lessor on the basis of the value of the improvements to the land, at any time when said premises may be ordered sold by the lessor, or upon the termination of this lease by expiration or cancellation, and the amount derived therefrom may be paid to the lessee; or, at the election of the lessor, said lessee may be required to remove the same. It being provided that the lessor may order an appraisement or reappraisement of said improvements at any time, at the expense of the lessee. It shall be at the discretion of lessor whether lessee shall be reimbursed for any unauthorized improvements.
e. In the event the lessee is purchasing under the terms of this lease state owned improvements situate on the leased premises, he shall, until the full purchase price therefor is paid, keep and maintain adequate fire insurance or other insurance in some solvent company or companies to be approved by the lessor for the protection of the lessor therein.

7—It being further provided that should the lessee fail to pay the rental, or any part thereof, upon the date when the same is due, or shall fail to keep each and every one of the covenants or agreements as herein provided, then it shall be lawful for the lessor, at its election, to declare the term of this lease ended, and to re-enter and take possession of the said premises, or any part thereof, and upon the termination of this lease, either by expiration or cancellation, for any cause whatsoever, if said lessee shall remain in possession thereof, he shall be deemed guilty of an unlawful detainer of said premises, and shall be subject to eviction and removal, forcibly or otherwise, with or without process of law.

8—It is hereby agreed by and between the parties hereto that should the said lessee remain in possession of said premises after the termination of this lease, either by expiration of term or otherwise, that the said lessee shall be liable for rental during said possession; that said rental shall in no case be less than the rate agreed upon in this instance, but that the said lessor may reappraise said property and fix a new rate which shall be paid by said lessee during said continued occupancy. It is further agreed by and between the parties hereto that at the option of the said lessor, the said lessee shall be construed to be in possession of said premises and to be occupying the same so long as the said premises are used in any way to any extent whatsoever by said lessee, or so long as any of his improvements remain on said premises. It is expressly agreed that such continued occupancy shall not establish a new or extended lease term.

It is also further expressly understood and agreed by and between the parties hereto that in case the lessee shall refuse or neglect to pay rentals when due, or shall in any manner fail to comply with any of the requirements of this lease, the lessor is authorized to incur any expenses which it may deem advisable in making collection or otherwise enforcing the provisions of this lease, and the lessee shall reimburse the lessor on account of any and all expenditures so made or expenses incurred, including costs of suit.

Additional conditions, if any, set forth on the back page hereof are by this reference made a part hereof.

In Witness Whereof, The said lessor has caused these presents to be attested and sealed by its President and Register; and the lessee has hereunto set his hand and seal on this day and year first above written.

....
President, State Board of Land Commissioners

....
Register, State Board of Land Commissioners

....(Seal)

Lessee ....(Seal)

....(Seal)

ASSIGNMENT

...., the within named lessee, for and in consideration of the sum of..Dollars ($..............................), does hereby assign, transfer and sell all his right, title, interest or claim in and to the following described tract or parcel of land, to-wit:

The...

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

...., and the improvements thereon,

unto..

of.., State of..., and to his heirs and assigns.

Given under our hands and seals this..................................day of.., A.D. 19..........

....(Seal)
Assignor.

....(Seal)
Assignee.

Signed and acknowledged before me this..................................day of.., A.D. 19..........

My commission expires.., 19..........

....
Notary Public.

The undersigned bondsmen on Lease No.., do hereby consent and approve of the foregoing assignment, and by so doing accept the liabilities as set forth in original bond.

....(Seal)

....(Seal)

APPROVAL OF ASSIGNMENT

This assignment approved by order of the State Board of Land Commissioners this..................................day of ...., 19..........

By...
Deputy Register.

....
Register.

Fees for Lease Transfer:

Consideration ....

Recording ....

Bond ....

Assignment Recorded...

Lease of State Lands

No.........................

....Land

....County

....Lessee

Address:

....

ASSIGNED TO

....

Address:

....

Date..

Expires..

Please send this Lease when you make a payment. It will be receipted and returned.

BONDSMEN:

....

....

Revised May 20, 1955

The annual payments shall be made on the dates as hereinafter set forth, to-wit:

(6% interest charged on all delinquent payments)

	Month	Day	Year	Amount		Receipt No.	Date
First Payment							
Second Payment							
Third Payment							
Fourth Payment							
Fifth Payment							

APPENDIX C

Tabulation of Conflicting Bids

LEASES ON WHICH CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS WERE FILED

ASE BER	Expiration DATE	LESSEE	ACREAGE	COUNTY	APPRAISED RATE	APPLICANT OTHER THAN LESSEE	APPLICANT'S BID	ACREAGE	LEASE AWARDED TO
26320	12-23-55	Frank Moyer	640.00	Cheyenne	30¢	A. A. Polton	$1.00		Frank Moyer, Lessee
26209	11-12-55	Harry Lucke	640.00	Cheyenne	34¢	Winston Blokoberg Frank Heins	.63 .40		Winston Blokoberg
-26197	11-12-55	Floyd Renner	640.00	Cheyenne	34¢	Marvin Lowe A.W.& Roy Carroll	1.02 1.02		Marvin Lowe
-26192	11-1-55	E. A. McGlothlin	640.00	Otero	30¢	James W. Watkins	.50		E.A.McGlothlin, Less
-26262	12-20-55	Albert, Margaret, Robt. & Joe Smith	5,443.97	Lincoln	35¢	C.M.Baum & Jack Jones Geo. C. Norris Otha & John King	.50 .50 .30	5,443.97 1,602.16 5,443.97	Albert, Margaret, Robt. & Joe Smith, Lessees
-23270	12-23-55	F. S. Grimes	640.00	Kit Carson	37¢	Louis Loeffler	.51		F. S. Grimes, Less
-26333	1-7-56	August Frank	1,031.04	Logan 951.04 Gr. 80.00 Ag.	 40¢ 1.50	Richard A. Harris (Not interested in farm land unless he got grazing)	 .60 2.50	 951.04 80.00	August Frank, Less
-26408	1-1-56	Dzuris Bros.	640.00	Elbert	33¢	Forrest L. Head	.35		Dzuris Bros. Lesse
-26379	2-28-56	Beryl M. Wenzel	487.58	Baca 100.00 Ag. 387.57 Gr.	 2.50 .35	O. H. Vail	 3.00 .70		Beryl M. Wenzel, Lessee
-26385	2-1-56	J. E. Sparks	640.00	Kit Carson	35¢	J. Dewey Jackson & Son	.50		J. E. Sparks, Less
-26402	2-19-56	Henry J. Miller	640.00	Phillips 600.00 Ag. 40.00 Gr.	 $3.50 .35	Quentin Biesemeier	 4.25 .35		Henry J. Miller, L
-26590	2-17-56	Bob Johnston	4,800.00	Pueblo	.30	Ruth Calhoun McClain	.35		Bob Johnston

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS - Continued

Lease & Exp.Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.
								Brought Forward	0
A-496 12-1-64	R. S. McConnell, Inc. Box 276, Pampa, Tex.	1400.00	Crowley	$0.41	Robert Hoffman Rte. 1 Ordway, Colo.	1400.00	$0.50	Lessee elected to meet conflicting bid 1400 A @ 50¢ per A	0
S-32165 12-10-64	Elaine Krueger Palmer Lake, Colo.	640.00	Douglas	$0.25	Mary Hilburger Echols Larkspur, Colo.	640.00	$0.41 4 Yr. L.	Bd. felt inadvisable to separate school section from deeded land. Bd. issued 10 Yr. lease-640 A @ 25¢ per A.	0
S-30875 12-17-64	Robert M. McDannald Est. A. T. McDannald Houston, Texas	13,936.82	Lake & Park	$0.26¢	E. T. Orcutt Florisant, Colo.	640,00	$0.50	Bd, issued 10 Yr. L. to conflicting applicant at his high bid of 640 A @ 50¢	0
S-30681 11-21-64	Mrs. Frank Slevec & John Fodor Aguilar, Colo.	640.00	Las Animas	$0.35	Pete Cusimano Aguilar, Colo.	640.00	$0.65	Pete Bd. canceled Confl. App.-issued 10 Yr. lease to lessee - 640 A @ 35¢ per A.	0
S-30688 1-6-65	Victor R. Klein Kersey, Colo.	280.00	Weld	$4.50 0.42	Melville R. Allan Greeley, Colo.	80.00	Gr. $2.50 Ag. 10.00	Bd. felt inadvisable to separate land - 140 A @ $4.50 per Acre 140 A @ 70¢ per acre	0
S-30837 1-20-65	Quarter Circle Eleven Ranch, (Everhart Ranches) Colo. Spgs., Colo.	6800.00	Custer, Fremont & Pueblo	$0.28	Joseph Potthoff Rosita, Colo.	640.00 (Custer Co.)	$0.53	Bd. felt inadvisable to accept Conflicting Application @ 53¢ per A which was only 3¢ more than appraisal of 50¢ Bd. issued 10 yr lease to lessee-6800 A @ 28¢ per acre, average for whole lease.	0

Report through December 29, 1964

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

Lease & Exp.Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.
								Brought Forward	
S-30630 9-17-64	Allen G. & Herbert E. Abbott Keenesburg, Colo.	640.00	Adams & Weld	$0.45 $2.75				Bd. negotiated new 10 Yr. lease with lessee. 160 A Gr. @ 40¢ per A - 480 A Agr @ $3 per A	0
					Carl L. Bockhold Lakewood, Colo.	320 A	$3.25		
S-30604 9-9-64	Glen S. Specht Sheridan Lake, Colo.	305.28	Prowers	$0.40				Bd.canceled conflict & issued a new 10 Yr. lease to lessee 305.28 A @ 60¢ per A	0
					John Gentz Lamar, Colo	305.28	50¢ per A ≁ $1000 bonus		
					Harry A.Weimer & Martha A. Weimer Lamar, Colo.	305.28	70¢ per A		
S-28382 9-15-64	Glen E. & Reka Martin Akron, Colo.	206.00 113.8	Washington	$3.75 1.25				Lessees met high bid $3.75 per A 1.25 per A	0
					Kenneth J.Niebur Akron, Colo.	206.00 753.80	$3.75 1.25		
S-31775 9-15-64	Jay & Leota Hickert Akron, Colo.	70.00 419.00 1921.06	Washington	$3.50 2.00 .41				Bd.negotiated new 10 yr. lease with lessee. 70 A @ $4 per A. - 419 A @ $3 & 1921.06 A @ 41¢ per A	0
					Kenneth J. Niebur Akron, Colo.	179.00 141.00	$4.25 1.25		
S-30603 9-12-64	L.C. Winder Co. Craig, Colo.	798.58	Moffat & Routt	640-25¢ 158.58-35¢				Lessee met bid 158.58 A @ 75¢ per A 640.00 A @ 25¢ per A	0
					Roy Pitney Hayden, Colo.	158.58	$0.75		
S-30474 11-7-64	Wm.M. & Amelia C.Toedtli Boulder, Colo.	1280.00	Weld	$0.42	William Lott Greeley, Colo.	640.00	$0.75	Lessees met bid 640 A @ 70¢ 640 A @ 42¢	0

Continued on Pa

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS - Continued

Lease & Exp.Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.
								Brought Forward	0
A-496 12-1-64	R. S. McConnell, Inc. Box 276, Pampa, Tex.	1400.00	Crowley	$0.41	Robert Hoffman Rte. 1 Ordway, Colo.	1400.00	$0.50	Lessee elected to meet conflicting bid 1400 A @ 50¢ per A	0
S-32165 12-10-64	Elaine Krueger Palmer Lake, Colo.	640.00	Douglas	$0.25	Mary Hilburger Echols Larkspur, Colo.	640.00	$0.41 4 Yr. L.	Bd. felt inadvisable to separate school section from deeded land. Bd. issued 10 Yr. lease-640 A @ 25¢ per A.	0
S-30875 12-17-64	Robert M. McDannald Est. A. T. McDannald Houston, Texas	13,936.82	Lake & Park	$0.26¢	E. T. Orcutt Florisant, Colo.	640.00	$0.50	Bd. issued 10 Yr. L. to conflicting applicant at his high bid of 640 A @ 50¢	0
S-30681 11-21-64	Mrs. Frank Slevec & John Fodor Aguilar, Colo.	640.00	Las Animas	$0.35	Pete Cusimano Aguilar, Colo.	640.00	$0.65	Pete Bd. canceled Confl. App.-issued 10 Yr. lease to lessee - 640 A @ 35¢ per A.	0
S-30688 1-6-65	Victor R. Klein Kersey, Colo.	280.00	Weld	$4.50 0.42	Melville R. Allan Greeley, Colo.	80.00	Gr. $2.50 Ag. 10.00	Bd. felt inadvisable to separate land - 140 A @ $4.50 per Acre 140 A @ 70¢ per acre	0
S-30837 1-20-65	Quarter Circle Eleven Ranch, (Everhart Ranches) Colo. Spgs., Colo.	6800.00	Custer, Fremont & Pueblo	$0.28	Joseph Potthoff Rosita, Colo.	640.00 (Custer Co.)	$0.53	Bd. felt inadvisable to accept Conflicting Application @ 53¢ per A which was only 3¢ more than appraisal of 50¢ Bd. issued 10 yr lease to lessee-6800 A @ 28¢ per acre, average of four latest leases.	0

Report through December 29, 1964

LEASES ON WHICH CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS WERE FILED

Expiration DATE	LESSEE	ACREAGE	COUNTY	APPRAISED RATE	APPLICANT OTHER THAN LESSEE	APPLICANT'S BID	ACREAGE	LEASE AWARDED TO	RATE
12-23-55	Frank Moyer	640.00	Cheyenne	30¢	A. A. Pelton	$1.00		Frank Moyer, Lessee	45¢
11-12-55	Harry Lucko	640.00	Cheyenne	34¢	Winston Blokeberg Frank Heins	.63 .40		Winston Blokeberg	63¢
11-12-55	Floyd Renner	640.00	Cheyenne	34¢	Marvin Lowe A.W.& Roy Carroll	1.02 1.02		Marvin Lowe	$1.[illegible]
11-1-55	E. A. McGlothlin	640.00	Otero	30¢	James W. Watkins	.50		E.A.McGlothlin, Lessee	50¢
12-20-55	Albert, Margaret, Robt. & Joe Smith	5,443.97	Lincoln	35¢	C.M.Baum & Jack Jones Geo. C. Norris Otha & John King	.50 .50 .30	5,443.97 1,602.16 5,443.97	Albert, Margaret, Robt. & Joe Smith, Lessees	50¢
12-23-55	F. S. Grimes	640.00	Kit Carson	37¢	Louis Leoffler	.51		F. S. Grimes, Lessee	51¢
1-7-56	August Frank	1,031.04	Logan 951.04 Gr. 80.00 Ag.	40¢ 1.50	Richard A. Harris (Not interested in farm land unless he got grazing)	.60 2.50	951.04 80.00	August Frank, Lessee	60¢ 1.50
1-1-56	Dzuris Bros.	640.00	Elbert	33¢	Forrest L. Head	.35		Dzuris Bros. Lessees	35¢
2-28-56	Beryl M. Wenzel	487.58	Baca 100.00 Ag. 387.57 Gr.	2.50 .35	O. H. Vail	3.00 .70		Beryl M. Wenzel, Lessee	3.00 .70
2-1-56	J. E. Sparks	640.00	Kit Carson	35¢	J. Dewey Jackson & Son	.50		J. E. Sparks, Lessee	.50
2-19-56	Henry J. Miller	640.00	Phillips 600.00 Ag. 40.00 Gr.	$3.50 .35	Quentin Biesemeier	4.25 .35		Henry J. Miller, Lessee	4.25 .35
2-17-56	Bob Johnston	4,800.00	Pueblo	.30	Ruth Calhoun McClain	.35		Bob Johnston	.35

LEASES ON WHICH CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS WERE FILED (Cont'd.)

EXPIRATION DATE	LESSEE	ACREAGE	COUNTY	APPRAISED RATE	APPLICANT OTHER THAN LESSEE	APPLICANT'S BID	ACREAGE	LEASE AWARDED TO	RATE
11-18-55	✓ Timberlake, et al	11,120.64	Washington	11,040.64 Gr. 40¢ 80.00 Ag 1.50				Robert Timberlake and Sister, Lessees	50¢
					F. W. Claypool	$1.30 1.00	3,840.00 1,600.00		
					Vaughn Campbell	.60 1.00	640.00 1,600.00	Check short rejected	
					Clifford Carpenter	1.00	1,280.00		
					Roy Seedorf	1.30	1,920.00		
					Jay Hickert	.35	1,600.00	Too low	
5-1-56	✓ Clifton V. Winger	640.00	Logan	45¢	Harry Skiles	.60	Short check rejected.	Clifton Winger, Lessee	45¢
5-4-56	✓ Ruhaak Bros.	640.00	Washington	38¢	Jay Hickert	.60		Ruhaak Bros. Lessees	60¢
5-6-56	✓ Alona A. Meier & Irma E. Jelinek	640.00	Cheyenne	34¢	W.H. & R.T.Hale	.50		Meier & Jelinek Lessees	50¢
5-1-56	✓ Angus McIntosh	23,323.80	Kiowa	30¢	E. L. Mitchell	.31	680.00	E. L. Mitchell	31¢
					McIntosh agreed to let this acreage be deducted from his lease				
5-1-56	✓ Bun Lewis	47,294.25	Bent, Kiowa Otero Crowley	30¢	Charles Money	.35	2,403.87	Bun Lewis, Lessee 47,294,25 averaged 30¼¢	
5-9-56	✓ F.N. & Amantha Cunningham	640.00	Morgan	37¢	L.F. & James Messenger	.78		Cunningham, Lessee	78¢
					Louis Schmidt	.75	Too low		

2

LEASES ON WHICH CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS WERE FILED (Cont'd.)

ER	EXPIRATION DATE	LESSEE	ACREAGE	COUNTY	APPRAISED RATE	APPLICANT OTHER THAN LESSEE	APPLICANT BID	ACREAGE	LEASE AWARDED TO	RAT
521	5-14-56	Frank Marx	640.00	Kit Carson	36¢	L. A. Tatkenhorst	62¢		Frank Marx, Lessee	62
						Carroll & John Scharer	36¢	Too low, rejected		
528	6-8-56	Clarence Mellott	1,920.00	Kit Carson & Lincoln	37¢	N.A. & Leonard O. Smith	70¢	640.00 Board decided not to take this acreage out of larger acreage. Water located on this section. Rejected	Lessee Clarence Mellott,	37
471	6-1-56	✓ Roy Edgar	640.00	Otero	30¢	Zellah Mills	50¢		Roy Edgar, Lessee	50¢
475	6-22-56	✓ John W. Stout	1,280.00	Bent & Las Animas	25¢	Paul H. Moffat	20¢	Too low, rejected	John W. Stout, Lessee	25
494	6-16-56	L.C.Riddenoure	640.00	Otero	30¢	L. H. Morrow	50¢		Ridenoure, Lessee	50
524	5-26-56	✓ Peter V.R.Freeman	640.00	Weld	33¢	Carl A. Mays & Lee French	45¢		Freeman, Lessee	45
515	4-8-56	✓ H. A. Burkart	640.00	Yuma	35¢	C.T.Mann & Son	40¢		Burkhart, Lessee	40
413	3-25-56	✓ Arthur J.F.Lange	600.00	Kit Carson	2.00	Gerald Plantz	2.10	Lessee did not meet bid	Gerald Plantz	2.10
314	3-1-56	✓ Sprague Bros.	640.00	Weld	78¢	Walter Youngland	78¢		Sprague Bros. Lessees	.78

9

	7-23-56 7-22-56	Clarice J. Lybenenco Truman J. and Nancy McClure	1440 480.00	Elbert Crowley	$ .34 .30	J.J.Morland Edgar J. Cannon	$ .75 .35	1440 480.00	Lessee Lessee	$ .75 .35
	8-15-56	Leslie H. Parker	247.50	Baca	.32	Jim W. Perkins	1.00	247.50	Lessee	1.00
	9-5-56	Louis E.Railey	600.00 40.00	Sedgwick	3.50 .33	Don P. and Donna M. Jensen	3.60 .40	600.00 40.00	Lessee	3.60
	8-17-56	Paul W. Johnson	600.00 40.00	Sedgwick	3.75 .40	Herman Enninga	3.80 .45	600.00 40.00	Lessee	3.80 .45
	7-20-56	J. C. Abell	640.00	Park	.25	Carl Gilley (Abell would not combine)	.25	640.00	Carl Gilley	.25
	12-1-56	Joe Mathis	121.38	Morgan	2.25	Elmer Gerkin T. S. Writebol	2.50 2.25 Too low	121.38	Lessee	2.50
	12-1-56	Ted Addington	1359.77	Kiowa	.35	Marvin Gatts	.85	640.00	Lessee	.85
	12-31-56	J.A.& Edna Lamb	3015.24	Elbert	.40	A. Walter Butler	.41	548.92	Lessee agreed to transfer	.41
6887	1-1-57	Marjorie M. Ely	640.00	Morgan	.35	Frank Stoops	.70	640.00	Lessee	.70
919	12-1-56	D. M. Ballard	1279.67	Kiowa	.30	Harry Abrams	.65 .70 .35	639.57 640.00) 822.68)	Lessee .65 Averaged Board agreed that old lessee was pay: enough money and was entitled to new lease. Offer rejected.	.41
410	12-1-56	L.Elton Gent	640.00	Moffat	.35	Geo.Avgaris	.65	640.00	Lessee	.65
060	1-1-57	Juan, Jeannette & Eliz. Etchart	1960.00	Bent	.30	Chas. Watkins	.35 .50	640.00 640.00	Lessee Averaged	.38
						Steve Morgan and C. L. Beaman	.62	640.00	Board decided not advisable to accept offer/	
967	2-1-57	Harry Freeman	590.00 50.00	El Paso	.43 2.00	M. B. Whittlesey	.75 2.00	590.00 50.00	Old lessee just paid full consideration for assn.and entitled to new lease.	
945	1-1-57	L. C. Ridennoure	640.00	Otero	.25	W. H. Morrow	.50	640.00	Lessee	.50

2

2-27-57	C. W. Ayres	287.00	Elbert	$ .40	J. A. & Edna Lamb	$ .40	287.00	Lessee would not pay appraisal Lease to applicant		$ .40
								~~Acres trans. to date 5,031.79 Filed on to date 48,379.93~~		
3-1-57	Gene Nichols	640.00	Kit Carson	.45	Sidney Hubbard	640.00		"Short"check		
3-4-57	Jos. & Lucille E. Turecek	180.00 140.00	Arapahoe	2.50 .35	Willard Hubbs	320.00		Lessee met bonus -0-		
4-1-57	Ray J. Blackburn	1280.00	Bent 640. 640.	.30 .35	John S. Ebright	640.00	.35 Plus 196.00	Lessee met bid -0- averaged 33¢	Acreage 44,262.00	4,767.00
					R. D. Morrow	640.00	$100.00	too low rejected		
3-22-57	Helen M. Trewet	640.00	Morgan	.36	Louis Schmidt & Joe Christesson	640.00	650.00	Lessee did not meet bid 640.	44,902.11	5,407.00
4-1-57	Jno. E. Olson	640.00	Morgan	.37	Glenn Scott	640.00	100.00	Lessee met bid - 0-	45,542.11	5,407.00
5-1-57	Segelke, John Francis, Wm. & Burnie	1441.27	Morgan	.55	M.M.Mitchell & Sons	144	5,335.26	Lessee met bid -0-	46,983.38	5,407.00
					Herman Twomky, Jr		640.00	Too low		
					Clarence Peterson		64.00	Too low (averaged 46½¢ to lessee) on both leases)		
5-1-57	"	2962.68	Morgan	.42	M.M.Mitchell & Sons	2,962.68	5,866.08	Ac.Lessee met bid -0-	49,946.06	5,407.00
5-16-57	W. H. Gossett	600.00	Lincoln	.40	A.H. & Glenn Doak	Check returned "short"				
"	Alene Maytubby	1000.00	"	.40	"	"				
5-17-57	T. B. Graves & Co.	640.00	Yuma	.35	Edwin H. Heterding	640.00	640.00	Lessee met bid -0-	50,586.06	5,407.00
6-12-57	Reed Ranches	2560.00	Kit Carson	.42	J. Carl Harrison	640.00	57.60	" " " -0-	51,226.06	5,407.00
5-24-57	Matt Simonson	640.00	" "	.36	Sigwald Viksen	640.00	70.40	" " " -0-	51,866.06	5,407.00
5-27-57	John Dixon	614.01	Baca	.30	Fred C. Tanner	614.01	921.00	Applicant, lessee 614.01 would not meet bid	52,480;07	6,021.01
7-28-57	M. Earl Trainor	1922.54	Crowley	.38	Clifford Patton	1922.54	733.94	Leessee met bid -0-	54,402.61	6,021.01
7-20-57	Sam Shafer	640.00	Yuma	.40	M. W.Robt. Seward	1640.00	1200.00	" " " -0-	55,042.61	"

-26-57	Jno. Givan	640.00	Kiowa	$ .35	Arthur Mace	640.00	$ 50.00	Lessee met bid	-0-	55,682.61	6,021.0
-10-57	Melvin Sand	329.31	Adams	2.00	J. O.. Cavender	329.31	2500.00	" " "	"	56,011.92	"
10-17-57	Eresch & Hink-house	1920.00	Cheyenne	.35	Wm. Lange Ranch	1920.00	300.00	Applicant, lessee agreed to release land	1920	57,931.92	7,941.0
					Emmett Thrasher	640.00	96.00	Too low			
10-15-57	Elmo Adams	152.82	Prowers	2.04	J. Marvin Willhite	152.82 1¢ per acre	1.53	Lessee would not accept appraisal	152.82	58,084.74	8,093.
1958											
2-1-58	Paul Wiley	640.00	Yuma 215 - 425 -	2.00 .35	Dean Blume	640.00	160.00	Lessee met bid	-0-	58,724.74	8,093.
3-15-58	Leo Kiolbasa	480.00	Logan	2.00	Lawrence Lueck		48.00	Lessee does not want land as he is selling his deeded land to live in Colo.	480.	59,204.74	8,573.
3-17-58	Geo. Gooch	374.56	Moffat-195.40 179.16	2.75 .25	Max Paulovich	374.56	700.10	Lessee met bid	-0-	59,579.30	8,573.
3-24-58	Joe Oliverius & Elsie E. Oliverius	640.00	Logan 236 404	2.50 .40	Walter Schumacher	640.00	1248.40	Lessee met bid	-0-	60,219.30	8,573.
4-1-58	Mr. & Mrs. Frank Smith	640.00	Lincoln	.37	Warren Leonard & Annabelle	640.00	500.00	Lessee met bid	-0-	60,839.30	8,573.
5-1-58	Laurence Longacre	640.00	Morgan	.36	Margaret Hurley	640.00	83.20	"	-0-	61,499.30	8,573.
5-6-58	Delbert Hawkins	240.00	Logan 112 128	2.00 .40	Walter Schumacher	240.00	424.80	"	-0-	61,739.30	8,573
5-1-58	L.W. Schmidt, L. J. Schmidt& C. H. Kuper	1760.18	Prowers	.40	Tommy Shelden & Kenneth Haskel	1280.18	640.00	"	-0-	63,019.48	8,573
3 5-1-58	"	640.00	Prowers	.40	"	640.00	256.00	"	-0-	63,659.48	8,573
1 5-22-58	Louie E. Rieke	635.00	Logan	.37	Roy Buchleiter, Jr.	635.00	1365.25	"	-0-	64,294.48	8,573
7 6-1-58	Wm. Nicklas	640.00	Morgan	.37	John A. Johnson	640.00	320.00	"	-0-	64,934.48	8,57
6-21-58	W.R. & John B. Pfeifer	640.00	Cheyenne 240	.5~~4~~0 2.50	Wilbur L. Alvey	640.00	1536.00	"	-0-	65,574.48	8,57

3

6

LEASES ON WHICH CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS WERE FILED (Continued)

from Page 6

EXPIRATION DATE	LESSEE	ACREAGE	COUNTY	RENTAL	CONFLICTING APPLICANT	FILED ON	CONFLICT OFFER	RESULT	ACREAGE TFD.	TOTAL ACREAGE FILED ON
								Brought forward -		65,574.48
7-11-58	C. L. Bockhold	320.00	Adams	$0.35	W. E. Pope	320.00	$310.00	Lessee met bid	0	65,894.48
5-3-58	Gilbert Evans 145.5 89.71	235.21	Routt	$2.50 .35	Donald Lorenz	235.21	$300.00	Lessee met bid	0	66,129.69
7-9-58	Jas. A. Beverly	640.00	Yuma	$2.00	Francis Rogers	640.00	$612.25	Lessee met bid	0	66,769.69
7-23-58	Clarice Lubchenco	1440.00	Elbert	$0.38	Del Zane Carter	320.00	$472.40	Lessee did not meet bid	320	67,089.69
7-8-58	Russell L. Rowan	320.51	Logan	$2.50 .40	R. Lloyd Rowan Arlyn D. Rowan	320.51	$ 10.00	Lessee did not meet bid	320.51	67,410.20
8-18-58	Roy P. Johnson & Wayne A. Davies	640.00	Cheyenne	$0.37	Wilbur L. Alvey	640.00	1536.00	Lessee met bid	0	68,050.20
9-9-58	J. J Specht	625.28	Prowers	$0.40	John Gentz	625.28	$387.65	Lessee met bid	0	68,675.48
7-1-58	J. B. & Mamie E. Claybaugh	350.60	Lake	$0.75	Robert D. Leonard & Ray Paddock	350.60	$101.50	Lessee met bid	0	69,026.08
10-1-58	Harold Witte	320.00	Yuma	$1.50 .38	J. K. Hardwick	320.00	$200.00	Lessee met bid	0	69,346.08
11-5-58	Aaron S. Parker & R. S. Gaylor	505.18	Baca	$0.36	Victor Schnaufer	505.18	$505.18	Lessee met bid	0	69,851.26
12-1-58	W. E. Heginbotham	640.00	Phillips	$0.40	L. B. Miles	640.00	$528.00	Lessee met bid	0	70,491.26
1-1-59	John D. Leonard	320.00	Morgan	$0.30	Louis Schmidt	320.00	$301.00	Lessee met bid	0	70,811.26
12-2-58	Arthur Scheetz	640.00	Washington	2.25 .40	S. L. Lambert	640.00	$445.00	Lessee met bid	0	71,451.26
1-25-59	Floyd Renner	640.00	Cheyenne	$0.38	Malcolm E. Johnson	640.00	$100.00	Lessee met bid	0	72,091.26

From Page 7

LEASES ON WHICH CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS WERE FILED

EXPIRATION DATE	LESSEE	ACREAGE	COUNTY	RENTAL	CONFLICTING APPLICANT	FILED ON	CONFLICT OFFER	RESULT	ACREAGE TFD.	TOTAL T ACREAGE FILED ON
								Brought forward		72,091.2
2-21-59	James L. Green	160.00	Adams	$2.50 Ag.	Oliver Morris	160.00	$1200.00	Lessee met bid	0	72,251.2
3-1-59	Joseph A. Sellers	640.00	Pueblo	$0.35	John F. Martino	640.00	700.00	Lessee met bid	0	72,891.2
3-7-59	John B. Sanstead	640.00	Morgan	$0.43	Forrest A. Morrison	640.00	1948.80	Lessee met bid	0	73,531.2
3-20-59	C. A. Seal & Leonard Beeson	640.00	Kit Carson	0.38	Lawrence Basinger	640.00	800.00	Lessee met bid	0	73,171.2
4-20-59	Everhart Ranches	40,138.81	Pueblo	$0.25	L. C. Kieffer	920.00	92.00	Lessee met bid	0	75,091.2
4-23-59	Elmer J. Alderfer	160.00	Jefferson	$0.25	Ray H. Ohlbrecht	160.00	25.00	Lessee met bid	0	75,251.2
4-23-59	Elmer J. Alderfer	280.00	Jefferson	$0.25	Ray H. Ohlbrecht	280.00	25.00	Lessee met bid	0	75,531.2

as of 4-15-59

7

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

July 27, 1959

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acreage Tfd.	Total Acreage Filed On	To ag to
								Brought forward		-75,531.26	
5-17-59	Thomas, Andrew & Joe Djuris	640.00	Elbert	$0.37	Richard V. Stoll	640.00	$ 640.00	Lessee met bid	0	76,171.26	9,
6-20-59	Fred Bangerter	640.00	Crowley	$0.40	Harry Doak	640.00	$1500.00	Lessee met bid	0	76,311.26	9,
6-18-59	Hubert R. Gaddis	640.00	Pueblo	$0.30	Marland C. Edens R. L. Gilley	640.00	$ [illegible] $ 226.00 *$ 600.00	Lessee met bid	0	77,451.26	9,
6-21-59	Harry Engelker	640.00	Sedgwick	$4.00 0.35	J. R. Sutton Walter Lueth Earl E. Kenney	640.00	*$3000.00 $2000.00 $1650.00	Lessee did not meet bid	640.00	78,091.26	9,
7-21-59	Joe Lousberg	400.00	Logan	$3.00 $0.40	Cletus Wernsman	400.00	$1500.00	Lessee met bid	0	78,491.26	9,
7-21-59	George J. Brown	160.00	Logan	$3.00 0.40	Edward Brekel Larry Wernsman	160.00	$ [illegible] $ 35.00 914.50	Lessee met bid	0	78,651.26	9,
6-7-59	O. C. Pickering	4390.89	Grand	$0.30	Fred M. Grimes	4390.89	$1000.00	Lessee met bid	0	83,042.15	9,
7-12-59	A. A. Pelton	480.00	Cheyenne	$2.50 0.40	Victor Weed	480.00	$750.00	Lessee met bid	0	83,522.15	9,

as of 7-27-59

September 10, 1959

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acreage Tfd.	Total Acreage Filed On	To ac to
								Brought forward		83,522.15	9,
8-25-59	Mrs. J. M. Newell	3569.85	Lincoln	$0.42	James R. Logan	1920.00	$ 960.00	Lessee met bid	0	85,442.15	9,
10-1-59	E. B. Keith	640.00	Weld	$2.75 $0.40	Lester, Carrol & Glenn Clark	640.00	$ 869.35	Lessee met bid	0	86,082.15	9,
10-1-59	Harold Heyse	720.00	Lincoln	$0.40 per A.	Donald T. Hart Harry Dock	720.00	$1.00 per A. $1300.00	Lessee met bid	0	86,802.15	9,
10-18-59	Neil White	640.00	Adams	$2.75 $0.40	Charles E. Borum	640.00	$ 100.00	Lessee met bid	0	87,442.15	9,
9-21-59	John A. Davis	640.00	Lincoln	$0.40	Ronald Anderson	640.00	50¢ per Acre	Lessee met bid	0	88,082.15	9,

ao7 9-10-59

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

February 5, 1960

	Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acreage Tfd.	Total Acreage Filed On	T
									Brought forward		88,082.15	
06	10-17-59	Mrs. Noma Johnson	640.00	Dolores	$0.60	Howard E. Creager	640.00	$266.40 plus 74¢ per A.	Lessee met bid	0	88,722.15	
22	11-21-59	Daisy D. Young	640.00	Kit Carson	0.40	Herschel Salmans	640.00	$1000.00	Lessee did not meet bid	640	89,362.15	1
28	12-1-59	Paul Pollreis	640.00	Cheyenne	$0.44	Harry Owen	640.00	$320 plus 76¢ per A.	Lessee met bid	0	90,002.15	1
06	12-20-59	H. J. Emmerling	640.00	Lincoln	$0.40	James G. Bruch Howard Smithburg	640.00	$460.80 plus 50¢ per A. $320 plus 50¢ per A.	Lessee met highest bid	0	90,642.15	1
3	12-29-59	John H. Buyer	960.00	Park	$0.40	Avid T. Temple	960.00	$800 plus 40¢ per A.	Lessee met bid	0	91,602.15	1
10	12-29-59	H.P. & E.A.Meyers	320.00	El Paso	$0.50	R. H. Fuchs	320.00	$1.25 per acre	Lessee met bid	0	91,922.15	1
55	2-1-60	R. J. Lamborn	4320.00	Morgan	$0.40	Whittington Bros.	4320.00	60¢ per A.	Lessee met bid 2,592.00	0	96,242.15	1
6	1-25-60	Emmet N. Rains	160.00	Otero	$4.00 Ag. $0.40 Gr.	Lowell R.,Russell & Clarence F.Norris	160.00	70 A.@ $5 90 A.@ 40¢	Lessee met bid 36.00	0	96,402.15	1
509	3-1-60	Laura C. Best	640.00	Weld	$0.50	David E. Uhl	640.00	$1000.00	Lessee met bid 1,000.00	0	97,042.15	1
560	2-20-60	Helgot Bros.	640.00	Morgan	$0.45	Gene L. Linnebur	640.00	$800 plus 50¢ per A.	Lessee met bid 480.00	0	97,682.15	1

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS (Continued) February 5, 1960

	Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acreage Tfd.	Total Acreage Filed On	T
									Brought forward		97,682.15	1
2	3-12-60	W. G. Kuttler	640.00	Cheyenne	$0.45	John E. Harker	640.00	$1600.00	Lessee met bid 1600.00	0	98,322.15	1
15	1-11-60	J.B. & Jewell Linker	640.00	Washington	$2.25	Roy E. Vaughn	640.00	$2.55 per acre	Lessee met bid	0	98,962.15	1

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

May 10, 1960

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Tot age to
								Brought Forward		98962.15	104
3-25-60	Robert W. & Alice Thomas	640.00	Washington	$0.45	John Pachner	640.00	$100.00	Lessee met bid [illegible]	0	98962.15	104
4-8-60	Kenneth Kinnie	160.00	Sedgwick	$4.00 Ag.	Darrall R. Hiatt M.J.Renquist Victor H.Buchholz Elton O'Dell	160.00	$960.00 plus 4.50 per A. $800.00 plus 4.00 per A. $750.00 plus 4.00 per A. $5.00 per A.	Lessee met bid	0 0	99122.15	104
5 5-14-60	B. J. Jones	640.00	Las Animas	$1.00	Marshall Lee Fullbright	640.00	$1.00 per A.	Lessee met bid 640.00	0	99762.15	10
4-26-60	L. W. Bailey	320.00	Adams	$0.50	Sam Krieg	320.00	$0.50	Lessee met bid 160.00	0	100,082.15	10
1 6-15-60	Reinhold Horst	640.00	Weld	$0.42	Jacob Allmer	640.00	$50.00 plus $1.00 per A.	Lessee met bid 650.00	0	100722.15	10
9 4-22-60	G. E. Brandt	640.00	Cheyenne	$0.54	John Cullen	640.00	Both Apps. Canceled a/c subleasing in previous years.		0	[illegible]	[illegible]
9 6-28-60	David J. Simpson	640.00	Adams	$0.40	Lester Schlagel	640.00	$0.80 per A.	Lessee met bid 512.00	0	100722.15	10
14 3-30-60	Hubert Keeney	1120.00	El Paso	$0.45	[illegible] Wayne E. Booker	1120.00	$0.90 per A.	Lessee met bid 1008.00	0	101842.15	10

Rept
~~Typed~~ through May 10, 1960

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

August 24, 1960

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Tot age to
								Brought forward		105402.14	
9-1-60	Lee M. & H. C. Thompson Genoa, Colo.	320.00	Lincoln	$2.50	Arnold Kjosness & Sons, Genoa, Colo.	320.00	$2.50 per A ≠$700 Bonus	Lessee met bid	0	105722.14	104
ation submitted by Kjosness & Sons rejected because the dated 6-24-60 in amount of $1506 was returned to this marked "Insufficient funds" and was unpaid).											
9-14-60	Harry Scott Sprague Velma Fae Sprague Holyoke, Colo.	640.00	Phillips	$0.50	Fred C. Hagerman Holyoke, Colo.	640.00	$1.00 per A.	Lessee met bid 640.00	0	106362.14	104
9-18-60	C. W. Husenetter Stratton, Colo.	640.00	Kit Carson	$0.45	Kenneth Scheierman Stratton, Colo. Herbert Scheierman Stratton, Colo.	640.00	$1 per A. ≠ $125 bonus 70¢ perA. ≠ $1000 bonus	Lessee met bid 660.83	0	107002.14	1049
8-17-60	F. W. Segelke, et al Hillrose, Colo.	7321.76	Morgan	$0.50	Mitchell L. & L.Co. Brush, Colo.	7321.76	80¢ per A.	*Rejected by Board 5,857.41	0	114323.90	1049
d by Board 7-12-60.* See file for further corres- and Board Order).											
9-21-60	J. E. Kester Sterling, Colo.	640.00	Logan	$0.50	Dr.D.M.McEndaffer Denver, Colo.	640.00	$1.35 per A.	Lessee met offer 864.00	0	114963.90	1049

,0

Report through August 24, 1960

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

August 23, 1960

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Total age to d
								Brought forward		102482.15	
7-26-60	Richard M. North & Ronald D. North Hudson, Colo.	320.00	Adams	197 A.@.44 123 A.@2.75	Richard Stinnett Brighton, Colo.	320.00	123 A. @ $2.75 197 A. @ $0.44	Lessee met bid 86,68	0	102802.15	104
8-1-60	James M. Crow Haxtun, Colo.	680.00	Logan	585 @ 2.75 95 @ .50	Gordon & Bernice McIntyre Haxtun, Colo.	680.00	585 @ 2.75 95 @ .50 ≠ $6000 bonus offer	Lessee met bid 82,50	0	103482.15	104
8-2-60	C. L. Nickerson Akron, Colo	640.00	Washington	400 A.@2.90 240 A.@ .50	Joe & Paul Hendrick Brush, Colo.	640.00	400 A.@3.00 240 A.@ .55 ≠ $1300.00 Bonus offer	Lessee met bid 190.00	0	104122.15	104
7-15-60	James H. Leander & Norman S. Leander Axial Rt., Meeker, Colo.	639.99	Moffat	$0.25	Harry Kourlis Axial, Colo.	639.99	40¢ per A.	Lessees met bid 256.00	0	104762.14	104
8-13-60	John L. Hammond Castle Rock, Colo.	640.00	Douglas	32 A.@2.25 608 A.@ .50	Kelsey Pottenger, Jr. Castle Rock, Colo.	640.00	32A.@3.00 608A.@1.00	Lessee met bid 608.00	0	105402.14	104

347A ✓
354A ✓
363A ✓
372A ✓
366 ✓

Report through August 23, 1960

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

January 9, 1961

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Tot age to
								Brought forward		114963.90	104
10-21-60	Jeffery Black Jr. Fowler, Colorado	1520.00	Las Animas & Pueblo	$0.38	Louis J. Nelson Fowler, ,Colorado	640.00	$0.50	Lessee met bid 320.00	0	115603.90	104
11-10-60	Stauder Farms, Inc. Fowler, Colorado	21,050.73	Pueblo	$0.33	Louis J. Nelson Model, Colorado	320.00	$0.60	Lessee met bid 192.00	0	115923.90	104
11-12-60	Marvin E. Lowe Cheyenne Wells, Colo.	640.00	Cheyenne	$0.60	Arthur W. Carroll Cheyenne Wells Colo.	640.00	$1.50	Lessee met bid 760.00	0	116563.90	104
11-18-60	Claude Ervin Seibert, Colorado	640.00	Kit Carson	$0.50	Eddie L. Fuller Flagler, Colo.	640.00	$1.00	Lessee met bid 640.00	0	117203.90	104
11-28-60	Raymond T. and Rose M. Downey Stratton, Colo.	640.00	Kit Carson	$0.43	Ivan Smelker Stratton, Colo.	640.00	$0.75	Lessee met bid 480.00	0	117843.90	104
12-5-60	Hillard Yost Haxtun, Colo.	304.00	Phillips	$4.00	Leonard L. Michael Haxtun, Colo.	304.00	$4.50 per A. + $1500 bonus	Lessee met bid	0	118147.90	104
12-20-60	Albert E. Smith, et al Tribune, Kansas	25,681.24	Lincoln	$0.45	Henry Eichman Rush, Colo.	640.00	$1.00	Lessee met bid 640.00	0	118787.90	104
12-23-60	F. S. Grimes Seibert, Colorado	640.00	Kit Carson	$0.65	Dean Jarnagin Seibert, Colo.	640.00	$2.00	Lessee met offer 1,250.00	0	119427.90	104
1-6-61	Gene Autrey Fowler, Colo.	11,566.05	Pueblo	$0.36	Ray H. Tilton Boone, Colo.	600.00	$0.80	Lessee met bid 480.00	0	120027.90	1049

Board ordered on above lease - 600 acres @ 80¢ and 10,966.05 acres @ 36¢ - averaged rental per annum .3828 per acre for 6 Yr. lease.

Report through January 9, 1961.

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS (Continued)

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	To ag to
								Brought forward		131893.83	111
2-27-61	Albert Filling Alamosa, Colo.	160.00	Alamosa	40¢per A.				Lessee met highest bid	0	132053.83	111
					George A. Wolf Alamosa, Colo.	160.00	50¢ per Acre	80.00			
					Nick Rilling Alamosa, Colo,	160.00	50¢ per Acre				
5-6-61	Alena Meier & Irma E. Jelinek, Kit Carson, Colo.	640.00	Cheyenne	50¢ per A				Lessee met highest bid	0	132693.83	111
					Bennie C. Gibbs Kit Carson, Colo.	640.00	85¢ per A	800.00			
					Bert & Pauline McNeely, Kit Carson Colo.	640.00	$1.25 per A				
5-19-61	Ed. F. Sohrt Strasburg, Colo.	640.00	Arapahoe	50¢ per A				Lessee met highest bid	0	133333.83	111
					Joe Tapparo Strasburg, Colo.	640.00	75¢ per Acre	588.80			
					Marvin L. Atwater Bennett, Colo.	640.00	92¢ per Acre				
5-26-61	Peter V. R. Freeman Briggsdale, Colo.	640.00	Weld	50¢ per A				Lessee did not meet bid		133973.83	117
					Carl E. Mays, Briggsdale, Colo. Leo Frank, Greeley, Colo.	640.00	50¢ per A plus $1.50 per A. bonus	960.00	640.		
5-15-61	Geo. Peterson Brush, Colo.	640.00	Morgan	40¢ per A		640.00		Lessee met bid	0	134613.83	117
					Vale Blessing, Jr. Brush, Colo.		$1 per A.	640.00			
5-12-61	Geo. M. Davis Deertrail, Colo	960.86	Arapahoe	$1 on 640 45¢-320.86				Lessee met bid	0	135253.83	117
					Paul & Elva I. Monnahan Deertrail, Colo.	640.00	$1 per A on 640 Acres	640.00			

Report through April 25, 1961

Tony

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

April 25, 1961

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Tota age to c
								Brought forward		120027.90	1049
11-18-60	Robert M. Timberlake and Beverly E. Gruy 4516 Cumberland Circle El Paso, Texas	11,120.64	Washington	63 A.@1.50 11057.64 @ 50¢	W.C.Cattle Co. Yuma, Colo.	7280.64 @ 76¢ per A.	76¢ perA	Lease awarded to lessee 5,533.29	0	127308.54	1049
2-1-61	M.M.Edmunds Vona, Colo.	640.00	Kit Carson	50¢	James L.McCormick Stratton, Colo.	640.00	$1.35 per A.	Lessee did not meet bid 864.00	640	127943.54	1113
1-24-61	Ray Birchler Bristol, Colo.	80.00	Prowers	Agr.2.50	P. Jess Rink Bristol, Colo.	80.00	$4.00 per A.	Lessee met bid	0	128023.54	1113
2-4-61	Dayton O.Taylor Campo, Colo.	518.86	Baca	45¢	Leslie M.Brite Campo, Colo.	518.86	$1.00 per A.	Lessee met bid 518.86	0	128547.40	111
2-11-61	O.L.Fortner Limon, Colo.	640.00	Lincoln	45¢	Jack Shinogle Limon, Colo.	640.00	$1.25 per A.	Lessee met bid 800.00	0	129187.40	111
3-1-61	Robert J. Wallace Pueblo, Colo.	200.00	Pueblo	25¢	Opal Jackson Pueblo, Colo.	200.00	$0.40 per A.	Lessee met bid 80.00	0	129387.40	111
1-10-61	John F.Craig & Son Limon, Colo.	5415.18	Lincoln	45¢	Chas. J. Rouse Limon, Colo.	2506.43	60¢ per A $1500 bonus	Lessee met bid	0	131893.83	111

October 11, 1961

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Tota age to
								Brought forward		135253.83	1177
5-10-61	Elmer P. White Rye Star Rte. Pueblo, Colo.	280.00	Pueblo	35¢ per A.	George W. Pigg Rye Star Rte., Pueblo, Colo.	280.00	50¢ per A.	Lessee met bid 140.00	0	135533.83	1177
5-21-61	J.Paul & R.D.Jones Elbert, Colo.	680.00	Elbert	45¢ per A	Welda S.Raisbeck Kiowa, Colo.	640.00	80¢ per A.	Lessee met bid 512.00	0	136173.83	117
5-4-61	John C. & J.A.Kingsbury, Greeley, Colo.	640.89 30.056 R/W 1247-12	Morgan & Weld		Lester Schlagel Ft. Morgan, Colo.						
1-84A application Cancelled May 3, 1961, at applicant's request											
6-9-61	C.K.Weissenfluh Yoder, Colo.	640.00	El Paso	50¢ per A.	Russell Higgins Yoder, Colo.	640.00	80¢ per A.	Lessee met bid 512.00	0	136813.83	117
6-2-61	John Arthurs Yoder, Colo.	640.00	El Paso	45¢ per A.	C. H. Allen, Yoder	640.00	70¢ per A.	Lessee met bid 448.00	0	137453.83	117
6-12-61	C.W.Book, Two Buttes	640.00	Prowers	46¢ perA.	Geo.W.Brann, Granada	640.00	46¢ per A.	Lessee met bid 294.40	0	138093.83	117
9-22-61	Louis & Betty Vratil Limon, Colo,	318.33	Elbert	$2.00 & $0.45	C. E. Horner, Limon Colorado	318.33	$300 bonus bid	Lessees met bid	0	138412.16	117

Report through October 11, 1961

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

September 28, 1962

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	To ag to
								Brought forward	-	138612.16	11
0 2-1-62	Marie Van Norman 214 N. 7th Ave. Sterling, Colo.	615 Agr. 25 Gr.	Logan	$2.00 .45	Lester C. Knowles Willard, Colo.	320.00	$2.00 Bonus $10	Lessee met bid	0	138732.16	11
0 3-25-62	Gerald Plantz Burlington, Colo.	600 Agr.	Kit Carson	$2.00				Lessee met bid	0	139332.16	11
					Ralph Kleveno Burlington, Colo	600.00	$4.00				
0 4-3-62	Dean Wigton Stratton, Colo.	640	Kit Carson	.45				Lessee met bid	0	139972.16	11
					Thomas McCormick Stratton, Colo.	117 Ag. 523 Gr. 640	$6.00 1.45	758.25			
3 4-1-62	Timberlake Cattle Co. Denver, Colo.	47,526.25	Bent, Crowley Kiowa & Otero	.40							
					Ronald Anderson Arlington, Colo.	22386.37	.80	Canceled by Board at contesting applicant's request. Lease issued to lessee.			
4-5-62	Karl Osthoff Anton, Colo.	160	Washington	$2.00				Lessee met bid	0	140132.16	11
					V. L. Rambat Anton, Colo.	160 Agr.	$3.50				
4-2362	Bohl Farms Kanorado, Kans.	80	Kit Carson	.45				Lessee met bid	0	140212.16	11
					Albert Statler & Sons, Kanorado, Kans.	80	.75	60.00			
5 7-21-62	Roy & Mark Lintz Akron, Colorado	640	Washington	505 Agr. 2.50 135 Gr. .50				Lessee met bid	0	140852.16	11
					Val Nieber Akron, Colo.	640	505 Agr. $4.06 135 Gr. 1.00	135.00			

Continued on next page

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS - Continued

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Tot ag to
								Brought forward		140852.16	117
7-22-62	R. M. Hough Ft. Morgan, Colo.	640	Washington	600 Ag.$2 40 Gr.50¢	Val Niebur Akron,Colo.	640	600 Ag.$4.06 40 Gr. 1.00	Contesting applicant canceled. Land offered at public auction. 100.00		—	
9-1-62	Geo. Hill Cope, Colo.	640	Washington	640 Agr.$2	Richard Mark Cope, Colo.	640	$4.25 per A.	Contesting applicant canceled. Land offered at public auction.		—	
10-16-62	Jerome Rober Julesburg, Colo.	1846.66	Logan	1846.66-50¢	Gordon McIntyre Haxtun, Colo.	1846.66	.70	Lessee met bid 1,292.66	0	143338.82	117

Report through September 28, 1962

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

January 22, 1963

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Tot age to
								Brought Forward -		142698.82	117
10-6-62	I.H. & Ernest C. Arnold, Steamboat Spgs., Colo.	5000.00	Routt	5000 @ 35¢							
12-1-62	Lloyd L.Burke Andrew J. Rudolph Wiley, Colo.	2582.39	Kiowa	40¢	Alva Thompson & Robert E/McCune	640.00	75¢ per A.	Lessee met high bid 480.00	0	143338.82	117
					F.L.Pyles Eads, Colo.	339.21 2243.18	$1 per A. 75¢ per A.	Lessee met bid 2,021.60	0	145921.21	117
12-1-62	Jamesena Wolfrum Keenesburg, Colo.	320.00	Weld	300 @ $2.50 20 @ .35	Roy Horii Keenesburg, Colo.	320.00	300 @ $5 20 @ 40¢	Lessee met bid 8.00	0	146241.21	117
11-19-62	Guy Paintin Stratton, Colo.	640.00	Kit Carson	20 @ $2 620 @ 45¢	William Schropner Stratton, Colo.	600.00 40.00	620 @ $1.11 20 @ 2.10	Lessee met bid 688.20	0	146881.21	117
12-1-62	George W. Berry Eads, Colo.	560.00	Cheyenne	560 @ 45¢	Robert T. Hale Kit Carson, Colo.	560.00	560 @ $1.15	Lessee met bid 644.00	0	147441.21	1177
11-15-62	Lester Engelhardt Wild Horse, Colo.	440.00	Cheyenne	440 @ 40¢	Curtis Schrimp Wild Horse, Colo.	440.00	85¢ per A	Lessee met bid 374.00	0	147881.21	1177
12-1-62	Ted Addington Eads, Colo.	1280.00	Kiowa	45¢ per A	Marvin Watts Eads, Colo.	640.00	$1 per A.	Lessee met bid 640.00	0	148521.21	1177

Continued on next page

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

January 22, 1963

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On
								Brought Forward	-	148521.21
12-1-62	Geo. G. Everett Everett Land & Cattle Co. Salida, Colo.	5793.69	Fremont	20¢ per A.				Lessee met bid	0	149161.21
					Alvin G. Black Cotopaxi, Colo.	640.00	60¢ per A.	384.00		
12-30-62	XY Ranch Co. Granada, Colo.	360.00	Prowers	60¢ per A.				Lessee met bid	0	149521.21
					Harry E. Higbee Granada, Colo.	360.00	$1 per A.	360.00		
2-4-63	Clarice Morrow Hasty, Colo.	400.00	Bent	28¢ per A.				Lessee met bid	0	149921.21
					Don H. Sniff Hasty, Colo.	400.00	$1.15 per A.	460.00		
1-1-63	Willard E. & Rose Marie Palmer Brush, Colo.	639.34	Morgan	50¢ per				Lessee met bonus and bid	0	150560.55
					Vale Blessing, Jr. Brush, Colo.	639.34	70¢ per A. plus $3000 bonus	1,047.54		
1-18-63	Tom D. & Thomas H. Bradbury Littleton, Colo.	2236.20	Arapahoe	75¢ per A.				Lessees met bid	0	152800.55
					F. B. Roop Byers, Colo.	1600.00	$1.25 per A.	2000.00		
					Cecil M. Cook Strasburg, Colo.	640.00	$1.25 per A.	800.00		

Report through January 22, 1963

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

February 26, 1963

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Fld. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Total
								Brought Forward	-	152800.55	11774.
								512.00			
2-10-63	Earl Weisenberger Scott City, Kan.	640.00	Kiowa	40¢	Philpy & Don Don Marteau Eads, Colo.	640.00	80¢	Canceled by Board, inadvisable to consider contesting application.	0	153440.55	11774.
2-24-63	E. M. Copley Flagler, Colo,	640.00	Kit Carson	160 @ $2 480 @ 45¢				Lessee met bid	0	154080.55	11774.
					Oliver Blanken Flagler, Colo.	160 @ $3 480 @ $1.50		720.00			
3-1-63	Ralph A. Cole-Est of A. G. Cole, Denver, Colo.	640	Logan	45¢				Lessee met bid	0	154720.55	11774
					McEndaffer-Torrey Cattle Co. Padroni, Colo.	640	$1.20	768.00			
2-23-63	Lester O. Beal Holyoke, Colo.	640	Phillips	$3.50				Lessee met bid	0	155360.55	11774
					Gordon L. Loban Amherst, Colo.	640	$4.50				
3-1-63	Gene Nichols Flagler, Colo.	640	Kit Carson	45¢				Lessee met bid	0	156000.55	11774.
					Julius Albert Guyn Stratton, Colo.	640	$1.05	672.00			
3-13-63	W. G. Lane Eads, Colo.	640	Kiowa	40¢				Lessee met bid	0	156640.55	11774
					Don Nelson Eads, Colo.	640	$1.00	640.00			
3-22-63	Ewald & Sophia Schmidt Brush, Colo.	640	Morgan	45¢				Lessee met bid	0	157280.55	1177
					Edward C. Weimer Ft. Morgan, Colo.	640	70¢	448.00			

(Continued on next page)

CONFLICTING APPLICATION (Continued)

February 26, 1963

piration te	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Total age Tf to dat
								Brought forward -		157280.55	1177
-4-63	Joe Otzenberger Sterling, Colo.	640.00	Logan	40¢				Lease issued to lessee	0	158560.55	1177
					Leon R. & Lorraine L. Thompson Willard, Colo.	640	40¢ plus $1750 bonus	Not highest bid 606.00			
					Vernon D. Hnizdil	640	$1.02 per A.	Canceled by Board, inadvisable to consider contesting application 652.80			

Tor

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

May 9, 1963

piration ate	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Total age Tf to dat
								Brought Forward -		157920.55	
-8-63	H. A. Burkart Stratton, Colo.	640.99	Yuma	640 @ 50¢				Lessee met highest bid	0	158561.54	11774.
					Edgar & Galen Lengel Burlington, Colo.	640.99	$1 per A.				
					John Hoyda, Jr. Stratton, Colo.	640.99	$1.10 per A.	833.29			
					Forrest Whipple Stratton, Colo.	640.99	$1.30 per A.				
-1-63	Fred B. Trostel Colo. Spgs., Colo.	1280.00	Bent	640 @ .36				Lessee met high bid of 60¢ + $1280 bonus		159201.54	12414.
					Dan & Emery Case Hasty, Colo.	640.00	50¢ + bonus $1000				
					John Ebright Hasty, Colo.	640.00	$1.25 + bonus $4200	Lessee did not meet high bid nor bonus on this land	640	159841.54	
					Fritz Schibbelhute Hasty, Colo.	640.00	60¢ + bonus $1280	1640.00			
-19-63	Henry Orth Lindon, Colo.	640.00	Washington	640 @45¢				Lessee met high bid	0	160431.54	12414.
					Kenneth Dozier Lindon, Colo.	640.00	$1.02 per A	652.80			
-26-63	George J. Ehmann Deer Trail, Colo.	280.00	Elbert	280 @ 41¢					0	160761.54	12414.
					Joel H. Fletcher Agate, Colo.	280.00	75¢ per A	Lessee met high bid 210.00			
-27-63	G. T. Lundy Genoa, Colo.	640.00	Lincoln	640 @ 45¢				Lessee met high bid	0	161401.54	12414.
					Jack Shinogle Limon, Colo.	640.00	$1.40 per A.	896.00			

(Continued on next page)

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS (Continued) May 9, 1963

ation	Lessee	Acreage	County	Rental Appraised	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Total Ac age Tfd. to date
								Brought Forward -		161401.54	12414.34
-63	Mary M. Snyder Akron, Colo.	640.00	Washington	640 @ 50¢				Lessee met highest bid	0	162041.54	12414.34
					Kenneth J. Miebur Akron, Colo.	640.00	$1.25 per A	960.00			
					Z. W. Johnson Akron, Colo.	640.00	50¢ + bonus $3200				
63	Daniel C. Kinnison Briggsdale, Colo.	640.00	Weld	640 @ 45¢				Lessee met highest bid	0	162681.54	12414.34
					Wm.Lester Bashor Longmont,Colo.	640.00	50¢ per A				
					Orlando L. Hill Briggsdale, Colo.	640.00	93¢ per A	595.20			

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

August 12, 1963

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Total Acreage to d
-24-63	Francis McCaffrey Wayne McCaffrey & Darrell McCaffrey Flagler, Colo.	640.00	Kit Carson	$0.43				Appeal Forward Board negotiated new lease with lessee-10 yr. lease @ $1.50 per acre	0	[illegible] 163321.54	12414 12414
					Glenn Jackson Flagler, Colo.	640	$2 per A	1,280.00			
-6-63	Angus McIntosh Box 67 Las Animas, Colo. 1072	4053.45	Bent & Otero	$0.22			22¢ per A	Lessee met bonus bid 22¢ per A plus $4049.67	0	167371.21	12414
					Geo. L. Fick Rt. 2 La Junta, Colo.	4049.67 bonus 22¢ per A		1,295.90			
-31-63	Donald W. & Richard R. Hutchinson Las Animas, Colo.	160.00	Bent	$0.35				Lessee met high bid	0	167531.21	12414
					Robert Carver Box 343 Las Animas, Colo.	160.00	$1 per A	160.00			
-12-63	C.D. Reed, Marie Reed Dave Reed Burlington, Colo.	7179.53	Kit Carson	$0.45				Lessee met highest bid $1.20 per A plus $300 bonus	0	163171.21	12414
					Eugene D. Fasse Rt. 1 Kanarado, Kans.	640.00	$1.20 + $300 bonus	828.00			
					Eugene D. Fasse Rt. 1 Eugene D. Fasse	640.00	60¢ per A + $200 bonus	Board negotiated a lease with lessee at rental rate of 50¢ per A in view of improvement work done by lessee	0		

(Continued on next page)

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS (Continued)

August 12, 1963

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Total age T to de
								Brought Forward		168171.21	12414.
5-25-63	Jack Herrin Rt. 4 Lamar, Colo.	640.00	Prowers	$0.32				App. canceled as contesting applicant did not submit his check for $1444 appraised value of impvr. 576.00	0	168811.21	12414.
					Charles E.Haskell RFD #2 Lamar, Colo.	640.00	$0.90 per A				
5-12-63	Smith Rancho, Inc. Box 215 Craig, Colo.	9076.39	Moffat & Routt	$0.22				Canceled as contesting applicant would not meet the appraised value of $4500 for impvrs. as set by Board 384.00	0	169451.21	12414.
					Estel D.Polley Craig, Colo.	640.00	$0.60 per A				
7-15-63	Riverside Irrig. Dist., P.O.Box 455, Ft.Morgan, Colo.	120.00	Weld	$0.60				Lessee met Highest bid 120.00	0	169571.21	12414.
					J.D. Lamont Orchard, Colo.	120.00	$1.00 per A				
5-30-63	H & Y Cattle Co. Rt. 1 Dalhart, Texas	1280.00 640 A @ $1.06	Baca	$0.37				Lessees met high bid 672.40	0	170211.21	12414.
					Cecil George Utleyville, Colo.	640.00	$1.06 per A				
7-28-63	Wm & Phillip O. Jensen, Meeker, Colo.	652.45	Moffat	$0.30				Lessee elected to meet highest bid 358.85	0	170863.66	12414.
					Raymond L.Jordon Hamilton, Colo.	652.45	$0.55 per A				
					Est.Joe Rader, Lydia Rader, Exec. Hamilton, Colo.	652.45	$0.52 per A				

(Continued on next page

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS (Continued)

August 12, 1963

Application Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Total Acg T to da
								Brought Forward		170863.66	12414
7-22-63	Ray Wolf Rt. 1 Olney Spgs., Colo.	640.00	Crowley	$0.41				Lessee not high bid	0	171503.66	12414
					E. A Wisner Olney Spgs., Colo.	640.00	$0.70 per A	448.00			
8-6-63	John Hickins 1133 So. 10th Ave. Sterling, Colo.	200.00	Logan	$0.30				Lessee not high bid	0	171703.66	12414
					Raymond H. Parsons Rt. 2 Sterling, Colo.	200.00	$1.20 per A	240.00			
11-1-63	Ralph L. Rickey Kutch, Colo.	640.00	Elbert	$0.54				Under authority granted Board in the provisions of Ch.112, Art.3, P. 13 Colo.Rev.Stat.1953, new 10 year lease was granted to lessee.	0	172343.66	12414.
					Burton Huss Limon, Colo.	640.00	$0.90 per A.	576.00			

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

October 21, 1963

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	Total age T to da
								Brought Forward		172343.66	12414
11-1-63	R.M.McMillin Box 911 Lamar, Colo.	200.00	Prowers	36¢	(Lessee got land 200 A @ 50¢ per A)			Bd.rejected Bowles App.Took into considera-tion this tract in relation to rest of unit operated by McMillin 400.00	0	172543.66	12414
					Truman Bowles Bristol, Colo.	200.00	$2 per A.				
9-1-63	Glenn H. Lewton Bennett, Colo.	640.00	Adams	615-$2.75 25- 0.35				Lessee met bid 25.00	0	173183.66	12414
					Marvin M.Barnes Box 444 Ft. Morgan,Colo.	615-$4.00 25-$1.00					
9-10-63	Melvin Sand Bennett, Colo.	329.31	Adams	329.31-$3				Lessee met bid	0	173512.97	12414
					Maurice E.Barnes Box 444 Ft. Morgan, Colo.	329.31	$4 per A.				
8-15-63	Edward E. Willis & Edward W. Harper (Harper & Sons) Toponas, Colo.	640.00	Routt	640-42¢				In accordance with the author-ity granted Bd. under provisions of Senate Bill #56 contesting application was canceled. 332.00	0	174152.97	12414
					John W. Bird Yampa, Colo.	640.00	55¢ per A.				
9-18-63	Malcolm McAlpine,Jr. Red Wing, Colo.	640.00	Huerfano	640-48¢				Lessee met bid	0	174792.97	12414
					Theodore Gomez Gardner, Colo.	640.00	$1 per A.	640.00			

(Continued on next page)

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS (Continued)

October 21, 1963

Expiration Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Tfd. Acreage	Total Acreage Filed On	
								Brought Forward		174792.97	1
10-15-63	H. F. Raith Ordway, Colo.	1920.00	Crowley & Lincoln	43¢				Lessee met high bid plus bonus $5000.00 1,287.20	0	176712.97	1
					Harold Nelson Hobert, Jr. Box 1226 Hutchinson, Kan.	1920.00	41¢ per A. plus $5000				
					John D. Beaty Ordway, Colo.	640.00	40¢ per A.				
10-19-63	Reyes E. Jaramilo Box 72 Antonito, Colo.	640.00	Conejos	60¢				Lessee met high bid 681.60	0	177352.97	1
					Donald H. & Harris Sorensen Romeo, Colo.	640.00	$1.065 per A.				

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS (Continued)

Lease & Exp. Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Tot Acr Fil
								Brought Forward	0	186
S-30254 1-1-64	Adolph Frank Granada, Colo.	640.00	Prowers	35¢				Lessee met highest bid	0	187
					Earl Williams Granada, Colo.	640.00	80¢ per Acre			
					R. D. Bamber Lamar, Colo.	640.00	60¢ per Acre			
S-30305 1-28-64	Ted D. Smith Colorado Spgs., Colo.	640.00	Douglas	$1.00				Lease awarded to lessee Ted Smith at appraisal of $1 per A. Contesting applicant did not agree to deposit check for $4590 to cover appraised value of Impvr.	0	188
					Kelsey Pottinger, Jr Castle Rock, Colo.	640.00	$1.55 per Acre			
I-1822 1-18-64	Quentin Dickey Fork, Colo.	160.00	Rio Grande	$2.30				Lessee met highest bid	0	189
					Willis Blau Del Norte, Colo.	160.00	$2.30 per A.			
					Dale & Robert Frederick, Del Norte	160.00	$2.50 per Acre			
					Chas. & Larry Worley Monte Vista, Colo.	160.00	$2 per Acre			
S-30275 2-15-64	Wm. John Van Valkenburg Coalmont, Colo.	60.00 Agr. 1629.40 Gr.	Grand & Jackson	$2 Agr. 25¢ Gr.				Lessee met high bid	0	190
					John Colburn Kremmling, Colo.	1049.40	35¢			
S-32486 2-8-64	Linley R., Marlin R. Stum & Jenean G. Schuler, Towner, Colo.	572.5	Kiowa	42¢				Bd. canceled conflict. Negotiated 10 Yr. lease with lessee @ 60¢ per A.	0	190
					H.W. Neugebauer Holly, Colo.	572.5	$1 per Acre			

Report through March 6, 1964

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

March 6, 1964

Lease & Exp. Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acre File
								Brought Forward	0	1773
S-29675 5-1-63	James Paul Kitch Rocky Ford, Colo.	4480.00	Las Animas	38¢	Glen A. Watkins Model, Colo.	4480.00	50¢ per Acre	Board held a public hearing on this contest May 16,1963. As a result of the information submitted the Board canceled the conflict and ordered a new 10 year lease be issued James Paul Kitch at 45¢ per acre.	0	1818
S-30654 11-5-63	C.D.Parker and R. S.Caul Gayler N.Star Rte.,Boise City, Okla.	505.18	Baca	38¢	Victor Schnaufer Campo, Colo.	505.18	$1. per Acre	Lessee met high bid	0	1823
S-30191 11-21-63	Earl Munkres Wild Horse,Colo.	640.00	Cheyenne	42¢	Allen D.Peterson Kit Carson, Colo.	640.00	75¢ per Acre	Lessee met high bid	0	1829
S-30234 12-29-63	W. F. Evans Kit Carson, Colo.	640.00	Cheyenne	40¢	Claude Nicolarson Kit Carson, Colo.	640.00	$1 per Acre 4 Yr.lease	Bd. canceled conflict Negotiated 10 Yr. lease with lessee at 50¢ per A.	0	183
S-30309 1-1-64	Leo C. & Mary H. Gallagher La Junta, Colo.	4036.21	Otero & Bent Las Animas	30¢	Mary R. Farthing La Junta, Colo.	3036.21	50¢ per Acre	Bd. canceled conflict. Contesting applicant would not pay for improvements-10 Yr. lease to lessee @ 30¢	0	186

Continued on Page 2

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

May 28, 1964

[illegible]	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Rtd.	Total Acreage Filed
								Brought Forward	0	19067
-3027 -3-64	Kiowa Co.Grаz.Assn. Towner, Colo.	640.00	Kiowa	42¢	F. L. Pyle Eads, Colo.	640 acres	$1 per A	Bd. canceled conflict. Negotiated 10 Yr. lease with lessee at 60¢ per acre.	0	191316
-3057 -1-64	Sniff Bros. Pueblo, Colo.	3520.00	Bent	35¢	John J. Ebright Hasty, Colo.	640 acres	$1 per A / $3360 bonus	Lease on 1 sec. awarded to contesting applicant at his bid of $1 per A. plus $3360 bonus.	0	191956
-30404 -3-64	Laurence & Dwight L. Kunau Rush, Colo.	640.00	El Paso	45¢	W. D. Sams Rush, Colo.	640 acres	$1 per A	Lessee met high bid	0	192596
-30339 -2-64	Guy Hinkhous Burlington,Colo.	1280.00	Kit Carson	45¢	Helen Ruhs Burlington,Colo.	640 acres	60¢ per A	Board canceled conflicting application. Issued 10 Yr. lease to lessee. App. did not pay for Impvr. owned by lessee.	0	193236
-30383 -3-64	Woerner Pauls Limon, Colo.	1609.98	Elbert & Lincoln	45¢	C. K. Carpenter Kutch, Colo.	640 acres	$1 per A	Bd. negotiated 10 Yr. lease to lessee at 45¢ per acre.	0	193876
-30397 -4-64	W.H.McKinney & Est. of C.G.McKinney Wray, Colorado	640.00	Yuma	48¢	C. L. Kempton Wray, Colo.	640 acres	$1 per A	Lessee met high bid	0	194516

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS - Continued

May 28, 1964

Lease & Exp. Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acres Filed
								Brought Forward	0	1945
S-30439 5-6-64	Harland D. & Doris M. Wells Star Rte. Del Norte, Colo.	141.31	Rio Grande	$1.00				Bd. canceled conflict. Negotiated 10 Yr. lease with lessee at $1 per A.	0	1946
					Cliff Jones Del Norte, Colo.	141.31	$2 per A.			
S-30445 5-1-64	Floyd Camp Vona, Colo.	540 Cr. 100 Agr.	Kit Carson	45¢ $2				Bd. canceled conflict. Negotiated 10 Yr. lease with lessee at 45¢ & $2. per A.	0	1952
					Paul I. Jackson Joes, Colo.	540 Gr. 100 Ag. $1000	55¢ $2 ≠			
S-30372 6-15-64	Harold L. Denson Bx.21, Del Norte, Colo.	120.00	Rio Grande	$1.00				Bd. canceled conflict. Negotiated 10 Yr. lease with lessee at $1 per A.	0	1954
					Cliff Jones & Co. Del Norte, Colo.	95 Gr. 25 Agr.	$4 per A $5 per A			
S-30420 5-1-64	L.W.;L.J. Schmidt & Earline Kuper Lamar, Colo.	640.00	Prowers	40¢				Bd. canceled conflict. Negotiated 10 Yr. lease with lessees at 60¢ per A.	0	1960
					Paul & Johnnie Weber Lamar, Colo.	640 A.	$1 per A.			
					Kenneth L. Haskell Lamar, Colo.	640 A.	$1.01 per A.			
I-1729 5-1-64	L.W.;L.J.Schmidt & Earline Kuper Lamar, Colo.	1760.18	Prowers	40¢				Bd. canceled conflict. Negotiated 10 Yr. lease with lessees at 60¢ per A.	0	1978
					Paul & Johnnie Weber Lamar, Colo.	1760.18	$1 per A.			
					Kenneth L. Haskell Lamar, Colo.	1760.18	$1.01 per A.			

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

December 7, 1964

ase & p.Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acreage Filed O
								Brought Forward		202537.
-30630 -17-64	Allen G. & Herbert E. Abbott Keenesburg, Colo.	640.00	Adams & Weld	$0.45 $2.75				Bd. negotiated new 10 Yr. lease with lessee. 160 A Gr. @ 40¢ per A - 480 A Agr @ $3 per A	0	202857.
					Carl L. Bockhold Lakewood, Colo.	320 A	$3.25			
-30604 -9-64	Glen S. Specht Sheridan Lake, Colo.	305.28	Prowers	$0.40				Bd.canceled conflict & issued a new 10 Yr. lease to lessee	0	
					John Gentz Lamar, Colo	305.28	50¢ per A + $1000 bonus	305.28 A @ 60¢ per A		203468.
					Harry A.Weimer & Martha A. Weimer Lamar, Colo.	305.28	70¢ per A			
-28382 -15-64	Glen E. & Reka Martin Akron, Colo.	206.00 113.8	Washington	$3.75 1.25				Lessees met high bid $3.75 per A 1.25 per A	0	204428.
					Kenneth J.Niebur Akron, Colo.	206.00 753.80	$3.75 1.25			
-31775 -15-64	Jay & Leota Hickert Akron, Colo.	70.00 419.00 1921.06	Washington	$3.50 2.00 .41				Bd.negotiated new 10 yr. lease with lessee. 70 A @ $4 per A. - 419 A @ $3 & 1921.06 A @ 41¢ per A	0	204748.
					Kenneth J. Niebur Akron, Colo.	179.00 141.00	$4.25 1.25			
-30608 -12-64	L.C. Winder Co. Craig, Colo.	798.58	Moffat & Routt	640-25¢ 158.58-35¢				Lessee met bid 158.58 A @ 75¢ per A 640.00 A @ 25¢ per A	0	204906.
					Roy Pitney Hayden, Colo.	158.58	$0.75			
-30474 1-7-64	Wm.M. & Amelia C.Toedtli Boulder, Colo.	1280.00	Weld	$0.42	William Lott Greeley, Colo.	640.00	$0.75	Lessees met bid 640 A @ 70¢ 640 A @ 42¢	0	205546.

Continued on Page 2

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

Lease & Exp. Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acreag Filed
								Brought Forward		252197.
					McEndaffer-Torrey Cattle Co. 3535 Cherry Creek N. Dr. Denver, Colo.	640.00	$2.00	on remaining 315 a. in lse.		252837.
S-31554 11-29-66	Harold Phelan Levelland, Texas	640.00	Prowers	$0.45				Lessee elected to meet high bid of $1.25 per a. and keep lse. Bd. canceled contesting appl. & issued 10-yr. lease to lessee.	-0-	
					J. Lewis Karn & Wilma Karn Rocking 7-K Ranch Granada, Colo.	640.00	$1.25			253477.

Report to date through 10-10-66

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

Lease & Exp. Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acreage Filed
								Brought Forward		247717.7
					Kent Saylor Holyoke, Colo.	640.00	A-$4.60 G-$1.00	Bd. ordered contesting appl. cancelled since this applicant did not submit improvement money. Ordered 10-yr. lse. to lessee at appraised rental.	-0-	248357.7
-31435 -17-66	Wm. E. Segelke, et al Hillrose, Colo.	7321.76	Morgan & Washington	$0.50				Bd. canceled Dave Lowen's appl. since lessee met bid of $2 on that section. Bd. canceled Tomky's appl. since lessee met bid on that section. Bd. issued 10-yr. lse. to lessee at averaged rate of $0.68 per a.	-0-	
					Dave Lowen Merino, Colo.	640.00	$2.00			248997.7
					Herman Tomky & Son Weldona, Colo.	640.00	$0.50+ $5000 bonus			249637.7
-31532 1-18-66	Mrs. Claude Ervin Seibert, Colo.	640.00	Kit Carson	$0.50				Bd. canceled all appls. in view of the manner in which the lessee had used land, and offered it for lse. at public auction 11-7-66. A 10-yr. lse. was awarded to the successful bidder, Norman Dean Jarnagin @ $3.50 per a.	-0-	
					Earl Cowgill Seibert, Colo.	640.00	$2.00			250277.7
					Norman Dean Jarnagin Seibert, Colo.	640.00	$1.75			250917.7
					Loyd Hostetler Seibert, Colo.	640.00	$1.55			251557.7
-31520 1-12-66	Winston Blekeberg Kit Carson, Colo.	640.00	pt. Kit Carson Co. Cheyenne	$0.50						
					Allen D. Peterson Kit Carson, Colo.	640.00	$1.00+ $640 bonus	Bd. canceled contesting appl. since loss of this section would seriously affect lessee's operation. A 10-yr. lse. was issued to lessee @ $1 per a.	-0-	252197.7
-31604 -5-67	Chimney Canyon Graz. Assn. Bx. 1343, Sterling, Colo.	955.00	Logan	$0.50				Bd. canceled contesting appl. Lessee met bid of $2 on 1 sec. and agreed to	-0-	

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS - Continued

Lease & Exp.Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Tot. Acr. Fil
								Brought Forward	0	20
A-496 12-1-64	R. S. McConnell, Inc. Box 276, Pampa, Tex.	1400.00	Crowley	$0.41				Lessee elected to meet conflicting bid 1400 A @ 50¢ per A	0	206
					Robert Hoffman Rte. 1 Ordway, Colo.	1400.00	$0.50			
S-32165 12-10-64	Elaine Krueger Palmer Lake, Colo.	640.00	Douglas	$0.25				Bd. felt inadvisable to separate school section from deeded land. Bd. issued 10 Yr. lease-640 A @ 25¢ per A.	0	207
					Mary Hilburger Echols Larkspur, Colo.	640.00	$0.41 4 Yr. L.			
S-30875 12-17-64	Robert M. McDannald Est. A. T. McDannald Houston, Texas	13,936.82	Lake & Park	$0.26¢				Bd. issued 10 Yr. L. 440 to conflicting applicant at his high bid of 640 A @ 50¢		208
					E. T. Orcutt Florisant, Colo.	640.00	$0.50			
S-30681 11-21-64	Mrs. Frank Slevec & JohnFodor Aguilar, Colo.	640.00	Las Animas	$0.35						
					Pete Cusimano Aguilar, Colo.	640.00	$0.65	Bd. canceled Confl. App.-issued 10 Yr. lease to lessee - 640 A @ 35¢ per A.	0	20
S-30688 1-6-65	Victor R. Klein Kersey, Colo.	280.00	Weld	$4.50 0.42				Bd. felt inadvisable to separate land - 140 A @ $4.50 per Acre 140 A @ 70¢ per acre	0	20
					Melville R. Allan Greeley, Colo.	80.00	Gr. $2.50 Ag. 10.00			
S-30837 1-20-65	Quarter Circle Eleven Ranch, (Everhart Ranches) Colo. Spgs., Colo.	6800.00	Custer, Fremont & Pueblo	$0.28				Bd. felt inadvisable to accept Conflicting Application @ 53¢ per A which was only 3¢ more than appraisal of 50¢	0	20
					Joseph Potthoff Rosita, Colo.	640.00 (Custer Co.)	$0.53	Bd. issued 10 yr lease to lessee-6800 A @ 28¢ per acre,		

Report through December 29, 1964

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

Lease & Exp. Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acreage Filed
								Brought Forward		20958
S-30742 2-18-65	Reuben Sandstedt Snyder, Colo.	320.00	Morgan	$2.75				Lessee met high bid $4.00 per a. for	-0-	
					Harvey P. Green Star Route Snyder, Colo.	320.00	$4.00	new 10-yr. lease		20990
S-30949 1-1-65	L. C. Ridennoure & Jerry Ridennoure Rte. 3, La Junta, Colo.	1280.00	Otero	$0.40				Lessee met high bid $0.50 per a. for 10-yr. lease	-0-	
					W.H. & Alma Morrow Route 1 La Junta, Colo.	1280.00	$0.50			21118
S-30659 1-1-65	J. H. Johnston Fairplay, Colo.	859.24	Otero	$0.40				Bd. cancelled conflicts & issued 10-yr.	-0-	
					W.H. & Alma Morrow Rte. 1, La Junta, Colo.	859.24	$0.50	lse. to lessee @ $0.40 per a. 673A requested		21204
					Loren Kanner Rte. 2, La Junta, Colo.	377.88	$0.80	appl. canceled. 673B did not pay for improvements.		21242
S-30728 1-26-65	Clarence Mason Olney Springs, Colo.	80.00	Crowley	$0.40				Bd. cancelled conflict & issued 10-yr.	-0-	
					Wilford Tomky Olney Springs, Colo.	80.00	$0.40	lse. to lessee @ $0.40 per a.		21250
S-30736 2-21-65	Raymond L. Dilky & Lois L. Dilky Big Spring, Nebr.	560.00	Larimer	$0.20				Lessee was not renewing; sold other land; no longer wanted lease;	-0-	
					Walter Lee Bellvue, Colo.	560.00	$0.20	Bd. issued new 10-yr. lse. to Walter Lee		21300
S-32254 3-2-65	John V. Hall Rye Star Rte. Box 203 Pueblo, Colo.	1165.23	Pueblo	$0.35				Bd. cancelled conflicts & issued 10-yr. to lessee @ $0.45 per a. Lse. was recently trans-	-0-	
					W.R. Kincaide & John T. Hudson 2125 Gale Rd. Pueblo, Colo.	1165.23	$1.02	ferred to John V. Hall & at time of transfer he paid a transfer fee based on $1.50 rate which was the rate established at public auction in 1963.		2142

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

ease & xp. Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acreage Filed On
								Brought Forward		214229.0
					Orval R. Hartman Rte. 1, Bx. 420 Pueblo, Colo.	1165.23	$0.60			215394.2
-30820 -20-65	C. A. Seal & Leonard Beeson Stratton, Colo.	640.00	Kit Carson	$0.45	Thomas McCormack Stratton, Colo.	640.00	$1.00	Lessee met conflicting bid for 10-yr. lse. @ $1 per a.	-0-	216034.2
-30884 -4-65	Carl Jones Holly, Colo.	640.00	Kiowa	$1.35	A. C. Reinert Holly, Colo.	640.00	$1.35	Bd. cancelled appl. of lessee since he did not meet bid; issued 10-yr. lse. to A. C. Reinert.	-0-	216674.2
-30840 -1-65	Frank Lucore Arriba, Colo.	640.00	Lincoln	$0.47	Joe McCormick Flagler, Colo.	640.00	$2.00	Lessee met conflicting bid of $2 for 10-yr. lse.	-0-	217314.2
-30933 -3-65	R. C. McNeill Thomas, Okla.	640.00	Kiowa	$0.40	Raymond M. Frazee Eads, Colo.	1120.00	$0.40+ $100 bonus	Bd. canceled contesting application, since the 1120 a. filed on by contesting applicant were transferred to him.	1120.00	218434.2
-30862 -15-65	W. B. Alexander & Eula M. Alexander Elba Rte. Akron, Colo.	640.00	Washington	$0.45	Joe Kral Woodrow, Colo.	640.00	$0.45+ $1200 bonus	Bd. ordered contesting appls. cancelled & lse. issued to lessee for 10 yrs. @ $0.80 per a. Bd. felt it was inadvisable to separate this section from lessee's unit since it would materially affect his operation.	-0-	219074.2
					V. P. Blessing Elba Route Akron, Colo.	640.00	$0.45+ $4000 bonus			219714.2

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

se & . Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acreage Filed O
								Brought Forward		219714.2
30932 10-65	C. B. McNeill Thomas, Okla.	640.00	Kiowa	$0.40				Bd. cancelled applications 65/206 & 65/206A because lease was transferred to Mr. Frazee and renewed under application 65/271	-0-	
					Clyde L. Frazee R. R. 2, Eads, Colo.	640.00	$0.40+ $100 bonus			220354.2
30883 17-65	R. L. Edmondson, Sr. R. L. Edmondson, Jr. Box 177 Lake City, Colo.	1080.00	Kit Carson	$0.45				Lessee elected to meet contesting bid of $1 per a. Bd. issued 10-yr. lease	-0-	
					Galen & Edgar Lengel Burlington, Colo.	1080.00	$1.00			221434.2
30930 18-65	George E. McKay Grover, Colo.	640.00	Weld	$0.50				Lessee elected to meet bid of $0.55 per a. for 10-yr. lease	-0-	
					David Bashor Grover, Colo.	640.00	$0.55			222074.

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

Lease & Exp. Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acr Fil
								brought forward		2220[illegible].
S-30869 4-24-65	Kenneth E. Eskew Springfield, Colo.	641.63	Baca	$0.38				Lessee elected to meet high bid of 62¢ per a. for 10-yr. lease.	-0-	
					Don Venter Rte. 1, Bx. 99 Springfield, Colo.	641.63	$0.62			222715.
S-30900 6-20-65	Fred Bangerter Rte. 1, Bx. 255 Olney Springs, Colo.	640.00	Crowley	$0.40				Bd. cancelled contesting application & issued 10-yr. lease to lessee @ 55¢ per a. Inadvisable to separate section from economic unit.	-0-	
					Robert Hoffman Rte. 1, Ordway, Colo.	640.00	$1.00			223355.
S-30944 6-7-65	O. C. Pickering Kremmling, Colo.	4383.63	Grand	$0.30				Lessee elected not to meet high bid on lease. A 10-yr. lse. issued to Gore Pass Ranch Co. @ 40¢ per a.	-0-	
					Gore Pass Ranch Co. Bud Hohnholz Kremmling, Colo.	4383.63	$0.40+ $1500 bonus			227739.
S-30944 6-7-65					William E. Ingram Box 25, Kremmling, Colo.	4383.63	$0.30+ $1500 bonus			232123.
S-30934 7-21-65	Joseph H. Brown Rte. 2, Fleming, Colo.	640.00	Logan	A-$3.00 G-$0.48				Bd. cancelled contesting applications; issued 10-yr. lse. to lessee: agric. land @ $5 per a; & graz. land @ $0.40 per a.	-0-	
					Norbert Burenheide Fleming, Colo.	160.00	$4.50			232283.
					W. M. Brown Route 1 Fleming, Colo.	640.00	A-$8.00 G-$0.40			232923.
S-30914 8-6-65	Estate of Neil Eugene Cleaves P. O. Box 123 Johnson, Kansas	640.00	Cheyenne	$0.45				Lessee elected to meet bid of $1 per a. Bd. issued 4-yr. lease.	-0-	
					Bennie E. Gibbs Kit Carson, Colo.	640.00	$1.00			2[illegible].

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

Lease & Exp. Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acreag Filed
								Brought Forward		233563
S-31199 12-3-65	William Quintana 2108 Sherwood Lane Pueblo, Colo.	80.00	Huerfano	$0.30				Lessee agreed to meet appraisal & keep lease for another 10 yrs.	-0-	
					Joe E. Faris 223 E. Elm Walsenburg, Colo.	80.00	$0.30			233643
S-31020 10-18-65	Neil White 336 Belmont Fort Morgan, Colo.	640.00	Adams	A-$3.00 G-$0.45				Lessee agreed to meet high bid of $3.53 on 640 a. Bd.	-0-	
					Jerral L. Danford & E. R. Skinner South Star Route Fort Morgan, Colo.	640.00	$3.53			234283
S-31200 3-12-66	W. G. Kuttler Arapahoe, Colo.	640.00	Cheyenne	$0.45				Lessee elected to meet bonus bid of contesting applicant; Bd. ordered 10-yr. lse. on 640 a. @ $0.95 per a.	-0-	
					John E. Harker Arapahoe, Colo.	640.00	$0.45+ $3200 bonus			234923
S-31195 3-14-66	Peter Stanko, Jr. Steamboat Springs, Colo.	1080.00	Routt	$0.45				Bd. canceled contesting application; ordered 10-yr. lse. issued to lessee @ $0.45 per acre.	-0-	
					Richard C. & Carl H. Blomquist Box 143, Milner, Colo.	240.00	$0.48			235163
S-31075 1-21-66	Helen & Robt. Burbach, Grover, Colo.	640.00	Weld	$0.45				Lessee elected to meet high bid of $1 per a. for 10-yr. lse.	-0-	
					Carlyle Smock Grover, Colo.	640.00	$1.00			235803
					V.H.Hillman Grover, Colo.	640.00	$0.60			236443
S-31127 3-1-66	Dolan Cattle Co. Pine Bluffs, Wyo.	1280.00	Weld	$0.47				Bd. negotiated new lse. with lessee as follows: 640 a. @ $0.75; 640 a. @ $0.47 per a. for 10-yr. lse.; cancelled contesting application.	-0-	
					Daniel Stanley New Raymer, Colo.	640.00	$0.80			237083

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

ase & . Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acreage Filed O
								Brought Forward		237083.1
31137 1-66	Elmer B. & May D. Johnson 2315 - 17th Ave. Greeley, Colo.	400.00	Weld	$0.45	Galen L. Callender 5715 Wadsworth By-Pass Arvada, Colo.	400.00	$1.25	Lessee elected to meet bid of $1.25 per a. Bd. ordered 10-yr. lse. issued; cancelled contesting application	-0-	237483.1
-31177 -16-66	David L. & Paul A. Ansley, Fairplay, Colo.	640.00	Park	$0.50	Paul Thompson Walsh, Colo.	640.00	$1.50	Lessees elected to meet bid of $1.50 per a. for a 10-yr. lse.	-0-	238123.1
-33280 1-1-65	Soapstone Grazing Assn., P.O.Bx. 93, Wellington, Colo.	3872.76	Larimer	$0.45	Angelo Roman 808 East 5th St. Cheyenne, Wyo.	640.00	$0.60	Lessees elected to meet high bid on the one section; Bd. ordered lse. to former lessee at average rate of $0.47½ per a. for 10-yr. period.	-0-	238763.1
-33279 1-1-65	Lazy D Grazing Association Carr, Colo.	6728.31	Weld	$0.43	Keith Roman Rte. 1, Bx. 84A Cheyenne, Wyo.	584.99	$0.60	Lessee agreed to meet bid on the 584.99 a. of land; Bd. issued lse. to lessee at average rental of $0.44½ per acre.	-0-	239348.1
-31076 -15-66	Keith Yonts Vona, Colo.	640.00	Kit Carson	$0.50	Henry W. and Alberta G. Tagtmeyer Seibert, Colo.	640.00	$1.00	Bd. negotiated a new lease with lessee for 10 yrs. @ $0.95 per acre. Canceled contesting application.	-0-	239988.1
-31146 -1-66	Paul Wiley and Wayne Wiley Laird, Colorado	960.00	Yuma	A-$2.00 G-$0.50	Alvernon H. Nolan Bx. 314 St. Francis, Kansas	640.00	A-$4.25 G-$1.75	Bd. canceled contesting appl. Negotiated new lease with lessee for 10 yrs.: 215 a. agric. @ $3; 425 a. graz. @ $1.; 320 a. graz. @ $0.50. Bd. felt it would damage the lessee's economic unit.	-0-	240628.1

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

ase & p. Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acreage Filed On
								Brought Forward		240620.1
-31246 -15-66	Wesley E. Signs Box 194 Hayden, Colo.	346.10	Routt	A-$2.50 G-$0.28				Lessee elected to meet high bid of $3.60 per a. on agric. and $0.42 per a. on graz. land for 10-yr. lease.	-0-	
					Richard C. and Carl N. Blomquist Box 143 Milner, Colo.	346.10	A-$3.60 G-$0.42			240974.25
-31219 -1-66	William E. May Briggsdale, Colo.	2174.76	Weld	$0.47				Bd. canceled contesting appl. of Roland G. Ball. Bd. rejected H. Magnuson's appl. on SW¼SE¼, but issued 10-yr. lease to him on NE¼NE¼ -Sec. 17, T.8N., R62W. @ $1.75 per a.; Bd. issued 10-yr. lse. to Wm. May: 1534.76 a. graz. @ $0.70 per a.; 640 a. graz. @ $0.47.	40.00	
					Harold Magnuson Briggsdale, Colo.	80.00	$1.75			241054.2
					Roland G. Ball Briggsdale, Colo.	1494.76	$1.25			242549.0
-31086 -1-66	Arizona-Colo. Cattle Co. 5001 E. Washington Suite 100 Phoenix, Arizona	66064.95	El Paso Pueblo	$0.35				Lessee elected to meet bid of $0.47 per a. on the one section; Bd. issued 10-yr. lse. to lessee on all of the land @ $0.35 per acre.	-0-	
					Fred Day Route 2 Colorado Springs, Colo.	640.00	$0.45			243189.0
-31154 -10-66	Skylark Ranch Co. Parshall, Colo.	316.50	Grand	$0.35				Bd. negotiated new lease with lessee @ $0.50 per acre; ordered contesting application canceled.	-0-	
					Carl F. Fischer Hot Sulphur Springs Colorado	316.50	$0.60			243505.5
-31106 -11-66	J.B.Linker & Jewel B. Linker 702 Cedar Ave. Akron, Colo.	640.00	Washington	$2.50				Lessee agreed to meet high bid of $3.50 and keep lse. Contesting appl. canceled.	-0-	
					Richard Masters & Earl Rodwell Anton, Colorado	640.00	$3.50			[illegible]

(Page 7 of 11)

CONFLICTING APPLICATION

Lease & Exp. Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acres Filed
								Brought Forward		244145.
S-31290 4-21-66	Bald Ridge Leasing 311 San Juan Alamosa, Colo.	5176.65	Conejos	$0.30	Braiden Cattle Co. LaJara, Colo.	40.00	$0.30+ $500 bonus	Bd. canceled contesting appl. at request of the applicant; ordered 10 yr. lse. to lessee @ 30 cents per a.	-0-	244185.
S-31315 4-10-66	E. Bass Clay 3214 Hayden Amarillo, Texas	1280.00	Bent	$0.42	Donald F. Dillon Rte. 4 Las Animas, Colo.	640.00	$1.10	Lessee elected to meet bid of $1.10 per a. on the one section. Bd. canceled contesting appl. Bd. ordered appraisal rent on other section--$0.42 per a. for 10-yr. lse.	-0-	244825
S-31362 6-18-66	Fred R. Salzman 523 W. 3rd Ave. Yuma, Colo.	640.00	Yuma	$0.50	Jack R. Bond & Lee Benton P. O. Box 118 Grand Junction, Colo.	640.00	$1.50	Bd. negotiated a new lse. with present lessee @ $1.10 per a. and canceled contesting application.	-0-	245465
S-31387 6-2-66	Marion B. Gartin & Joan Gartin Otis, Colo.	320.00	Washington	$0.50	Carl F. Errebo Rte. 1 Otis, Colo.	320.00	$0.50	Bd. canceled contesting appl. since the offer was at the apprsl. and was met by lessee. New 10-yr. lse. issued to lessee @ 50 cents per a.	-0-	245785
S-31401 5-1-66	Pat J. Tellier & June H. Tellier Mystic Route Steamboat Sprgs., Colo.	80.00	Routt	A-$2.50 G-$0.25	Richard C. & Carl H. Blomquist R.C.B - Bx. 143, Milner, Colo. C.H.B.-Mystic Rte., Steamboat Sprgs.	80.00	A-$3.60 G-$0.42	Bd. canceled contesting appl. since contesting applicant would have had no access to land; 10 yr. lse. issued to lessee at appraised rate.	-0-	245865

CONFLICTING APPLICATIONS

Lease & Exp. Date	Lessee	Acreage	County	Appraised Rental	Conflicting Applicant	Acreage Filed On	Conflict Offer	Results	Acres Tfd.	Total Acreag Filed
								Brought Forward		245865.
G-1615 5-3-66	Marvin M. Barnes Box 444 Fort Morgan, Colo.	320.72	Washington	$2.25	Glenn H. Lewton Bennett, Colo.	320.72	$4.00	Lessee elected to meet bid of $4 per a. and keep lease; Bd. ordered contesting appl. canceled and new lse. issued to lessee for 10 yrs.	-0-	246186.
S-31380 6-28-66	Kenneth L. Green Rte. 2, Bx. 39 Golden, Colo.	640.00	Gilpin	$0.28	Davis Vick Central City, Colo.	640.00	$0.30	Lessee elected to meet his bid and keep lse. Bd. ordered contesting appl. canceled & 10 yr. lse. issued to lessee @$.30 per a.	-0-	246826.
S-31366 4-8-66	Gus Churchalis Box 901 Craig, Colo.	717.97	Moffat	A-$2.50 G-$0.50	Donald E. Redmon 561 Lincoln St. Craig, Colo.	251.56	A-$2.50 G-$0.50+ $2000 bonus	Bd. canceled contesting appl. since lessee elected to meet bid of $3.50 on agric. & $0.58 on graz. Land went to 2 leases both held by lessee: one, agric. lse. on 182.93 a. land; other, graz. lse. on 81.49 a. & both for 10-yr. period. Remainder of land formerly leased by lessee went to mining lse. & was deleted from Churchalis lease.	-0-	247077.
S-31489 9-21-66	J. E. Kester 1322 Adams Circle Sterling, Colo.	640.00	Logan	$0.50	McEndaffer-Torrey Cattle Co. 4810 E. 6th Ave., Denver	640.00	$1.85	Lessee agreed to meet high bid of $1.85 a. for a 10-yr. lse.	-0-	[illegible]
S-31449 7-29-66	Robert F. Guernsey 1566 Adams Denver, Colorado	640.00	Phillips	A-$2.75 G-$0.50						

SUMMARY

Title:	A STUDY OF LEASING PRACTICES OF PUBLIC SCHOOL LANDS IN COLORADO
Investigator:	Stanley Mason Cole
Institution:	Colorado State University Fort Collins, Colorado
Project Number:	7-8167
Duration:	May 1, 1967 - April 30, 1968

BACKGROUND

The first comprehensive study of the school land leasing problems in Colorado was made in 1960 by the Legislative Council of the Colorado General Assembly. At that time an alleged conflict of interest in the administration of public school land brought an investigation of the administration of public school lands in Colorado.

The purpose of this study was stated to be: "to study the procedures and policies of the State Board of Land Commissioners with a view toward securing a maximum revenue yield to the public school fund."[1]

---

[1] Senate Joint Resolution No. 24, Forty-second General Assembly, State of Colorado, 1960.

A number of specific problems were examined concerning the leasing practices followed by the State Board of Land Commissioners. One of the major considerations was a comparison of rental income per acre from surface leases of land in Colorado with income from surface leases in eight other states.

It has always been the practice to compare rental income in Colorado with rental income of other states. A logical question might be asked: Would it be more revealing to compare rental income within the state and use similar land with the same use and the same economic influences operating?

To the writer's knowledge, there had been no study to date comparing rental income from state controlled lands with income from similar privately administered lands.

In the research of the legislative council, there were some further rental comparisons from county to county. However, the comparisons were based on state held land in each county and no effort was made to discern what similar private land was returning in revenue

Further, little information was available concerning the disposition of conflicting bids on public school land The practice of conflicting bids (two persons bidding on the same surface lease) had been on the increase in recent years.

And finally, an examination of the rules and administrative practices being followed by the State Board of Land Commissioners concerning subleasing, seemed defensible

The essence of this study is concerned basically with a thorough examination of policies pertaining to the three basic problems in leasing practices. These three basic problems have existed for a number of years and have had little basic research to provide information.

OBJECTIVES

(1) To compare income from leases on state school lands with income from leases of similar privately administered lands.

(2) To identify board policies and administrative practices being followed by the State Board of Land Commissioners regarding the disposition of conflicting bids on state school land.

(3) To identify policies and administrative practices now being followed by the State Board of Land Commissioners regarding the practices of subleasing school lands and its impact on the school funds in Colorado.

PROCEDURE

The following procedure was the original outline of Project 7-8167:

The procedure will involve four major steps. Twenty-five leases representing twenty-five sections (640 acres each or 16,000 acres) of state school land will be selected for the purpose of comparing income with twenty-five sections (640 acres each or 16,000 acres) of privately administered land. The twenty-five sections will be selected in such a way as to represent all types of land now being held by the State of Colorado. This land will be selected in consultation with one or more land board members. In addition the recommendations of a valuation consultant will be obtained. The twenty-five sections of privately held land and the twenty-five sections of school land will be selected from an area east of the Continental Divide since this is the location of most school lands remaining in Colorado. Also the twenty-five sections will be land similar in use and topography to that of each school section selected. The valuation consultant will also be used in the selection of these parcels. He will abstract out of the private leases all economic contingencies such as improvements, water, access and length of lease for the purpose of making income comparisons on the land only. It will be necessary to travel to each of the leases compared for the purpose of establishing the similarity of the state land and the private land.

Second, records on file at the land board will be investigated for the purpose of determining rules, regulations and policies followed in the disposition of conflicting bids on state school land. Also involved will be the tabulation and investigation of the final disposition of the conflicting bids filed on state held lands since 1960. This will be done in an effort to determine if the highest return to the school funds is currently being realized.

Third, an investigation of all the rules, regulations, and policies regarding subleasing practices will be made to determine if the public school fund is best being served by such subleasing practices.

Fourth, a comprehensive evaluation of Board policies relating to leasing practices, a summary, and conclusions will be drawn from the data and other pertinent information obtained.

The twenty-five sections of privately administered land were selected between May 10 and July 10 of 1967. It was found during the selection procedure that it was neither practical nor desirable to seek complete 640 acre sections. Many sections were partially leased or other circumstances made it impossible to select complete sections. Further, to select land in such a way as to represent all types of land in Colorado, more than twenty-five private held leases had to be used to establish clear trends in leasing income. Therefore, approximately 24,464 acres or slightly over 38 sections were used to establish income from cash rents on private property.

Further, the procedure was modified to put special attention on the South Platte watershed. There are two reasons why this special accord was granted this area:

1. The South Platte watershed contains an adequate sampling of the more productive land use classifications found throughout the State of Colorado.
2. The South Platte watershed contained the greater number of cash rents available for measurement of the leasing activities conducted between private investors.

Various other counties were sampled throughout the State. The foregoing is not meant to exclude other counties investigated.

During August, September and October of 1967 each of the private leases were visited by the principal investigator, the valuation consultant or both of these parties. Also state land in each of the counties covered in the "Analysis of Data" was visited to ascertain its character and use.

The second and third steps of the procedure were carried out on a full time basis during November and December of 1967. Records on file at the State Land Board in Denver were investigated for the purpose of determining rules, regulations and policies pertaining to conflicting bids and sub-leasing practices. At times this was difficult due to the lack of written policies by the board. Much of the policy was discussed on a person to person basis.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Cash rentals on public school grazing land in this study compare favorably with cash rental revenue from private grazing lands of comparable use and topography. While the school land revenue was slightly less, such economic contingencies as taxes, water development, electricity, and length of lease on private property make the ranges of revenue comparable.

2. Cash rentals on state grazing land appear to be equitable to the school fund and to the rancher/farmer. It was found during the course of this study that in many counties studied,

the State of Colorado retains grazing land that is not as good in quality as privately held contiguous land. Stated conversely, Colorado continues to sell state land of better quality while there is little demand for marginal land. This practice has caused some low rentals in certain counties (Logan County .20, Routt County .15) where much of the land is of poor quality.

3. On dry land farm areas the State Board of Land Commissioners appear to be setting rates comparable with private leased land of similar use Where there are large differences in rental ranges, real estate taxes, length of lease, cost of water, fencing and electricity generally account for these differences.

4. The greatest difference in rental rate comparisons in the study appear in the area of irrigated farming. The range in rentals on private irrigated land was $25.00 - $50.00 per acre with a consistent range of $30.00 - $35.00 per acre. On State irrigated land rentals in the areas studied rarely exceed $6.00 per acre with a consistent range of $3.50 - $5.00 per acre.

The explanation for this can be found in the fact that through the years the State Board of Land Commissioners have not made an effort to protect state water rights and encourage water development on State land. (See text page 65-67)

5. The State Board of Land Commissioners have broad powers in resolving the conflict bid. On the basis of the information obtained in this study, the Board has been exercising

prudent judgment when resolving the conflict bid. This does not always mean an immediate increase in revenue. However, these decisions must necessarily take into consideration the long term return on public school land. It is therefore concluded that the Land Board should retain this flexible policy and power to arbitrate the conflicting bid.

6. The policies concerning subleasing practices have been defined and delineated much more clearly since 1965. The subleasing that is currently being carried on is difficult to control. The Board however, does have firm control of the practice and when it is discovered appropriate administrative steps are taken to (1) correctly list the lease to the proper lessee or (2) cause the current lessee to lose priority on preference right to renewal.

7. Subleasing land for other purposes is currently being carried out by the State Board of Land Commissioners. Technically, this is more of a "multiple use principle" than a sublease. Hunting leases are being granted to at least two parties on land that has been leased to other parties for grazing. It appears that the board has no firm policy on this matter and there is no indication what policies the administrative body intends to follow.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

There are 10 references listed in the final report.

Publications

None